X79846

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/treatisesofstath01athaiala

SELECT TREATISES

OF

ST. ATHANASIUS.

VOL. I.

SELECT TREATISES

OF

ST. ATHANASIUS

IN CONTROVERSY WITH THE ARIANS.

FREELY TRANSLATED,

WITH AN APPENDIX,

BY

JOHN HENRY CARDINAL NEWMAN,

Honorary Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford,
and late Fellow of Oriel.

VOL. I.

TENTH IMPRESSION.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA
1911

All rights reserved

ADVERTISEMENT TO THE THIRD EDITION.

I AM obliged to accompany this new edition of my translation of certain Treatises of St. Athanasius against the Arians with some words of explanation, or even of apology.

When Dr. Pusey, with that generosity which he has on all occasions shown towards me, made no difficulty in my including in the uniform edition of my own publications a work which I had written for his "Library of the Fathers," it was my most anxious wish and my first concern so to avail myself of his kindness as not to interfere with the interests of his "Library," and I thought that, without being unjust to any purpose of my own, there were several ways in which I could consult for him.

It is with this object in view that I have omitted in this edition the so-called Fourth Oration, which is contained in my Oxford volume, but which, as is shown in one of my *Theological Tracts*, is not specially written against the Arians. This Tract also, with four others, is in the Oxford edition, and all five are omitted in the present, though contained in my *Theological Tracts*. A third divergence from the Oxford edition requires more words to explain.

At the time of the translation, in 1841—1844, to be literal in the English used in the work was a foremost duty. Those who at that date took part in Dr. Pusey's great undertaking were regarded with much suspicion, both by Catholics and Protestants, as if they were introducing the Fathers to the English public with a covert view of recommending thereby certain religious theories of their own. It was alleged that in truth the only high-church doctrine to be found in the Fathers was Baptismal Regeneration; translators, it was said, who went beyond this were to be watched, and any departure from grammatical and literal accuracy in their renderings was sure to be scored against them as a controversial artifice. It may be added that in some quarters an over-estimation prevailed of the early Christian writers, as if they had an authority so special, and a position so like that of a court of final appeal, that those who had a title to handle their writings were but few. It was under these conditions and disadvantages of the times that Dr. Pusey's translators, certainly that I myself, began our work.

Things are much altered since 1836—1845. I yield to no one still in special devotion to those centuries of the Catholic Church which the Holy Fathers represent; but I see no difficulty at this day in a writer proposing to himself a free translation of their Treatises, if he makes an open profession of what he is doing, and has sufficient reasons for doing it; and in the instance of St. Athanasius as little as of any of them, inasmuch as that great theologian, writing, as he did, only when he

had a call to write, and sometimes while he was driven about from place to place, is led to repeat himself, is wanting in methodical exactness, and, with all his lucidity and force, nay even by reason of the Greek idiom, admits or requires explanation. Not as if a translator had any leave to introduce ideas, sentiments, or arguments which are foreign to his original, or may dispense with a watchful caution lest he should be taking liberties with his author; but that it was possible, as I thought, to make a volume unexceptionable in itself, and sufficiently distinct from the one published in Dr. Pusey's series, and with a usefulness of its own, though I did not follow Athanasius's text sentence by sentence, allowing myself in abbreviation where he was diffuse, and in paraphrase where he was obscure.

This then is what I determined on, and thus I set off in this new Edition; and I so far acted upon this view that I am obliged in the title-page to call my work "a free translation;" yet I am obliged to add that the occupation of mind, consequent upon the high and unexpected honours and duties which came upon me soon after I had taken my new edition in hand, broke the continuity of idea necessary for carrying out what I had intended, and though the very want of uniformity in my treatment of my author's text answers the purpose of distinguishing this edition from the former, it is a great defect in the translation considered as a composition. One undesirable consequence is, that what are really free renderings may in some places be taken for grammatical mistakes.

Another alteration, far more noticeable, and unavoidable also, and involving more trouble than can easily be imagined, separates this edition from the first. In order to accommodate it to the reduced size of the page it has been necessary not only to leave out altogether the marginal references and notices, but, what is a much more serious matter, to change the relation of the Annotations to the text of Athanasius. In the first edition they ran along the foot of the page, but this the new page would scarcely allow. Yet annotations no longer answer to their name if separated widely from the text out of which they spring; nor are they commonly substantive and complete compositions, which bear to be let alone and can stand of themselves. They are written *pro re natâ*, capriciously, or at least arbitrarily, with matter which the writer happens to have at hand, or knows where to find, and are composed in what may be called an undress, conversational style; and the excuse for these defects is that they are mere appendages to the text, and ancillary to it. Hence to place them bodily at the end of the work which they comment on, besides its inconvenience to the reader, would be a half measure which deprived them of their intelligible office and drift, and of their claim on his attention.

If then the Annotations, originally illustrative of the text, were of necessity to form a separate volume, the only alleviation of a step in itself undesirable was to throw them together, according to their respective subjects, under various headings in alphabetical order, with such complemental quotations and such re-casting

of matter as might be indispensable and not too laborious, and might serve to form some sort of a whole, satisfactory as far as it went, whatever criticism it might fairly provoke for its many shortcomings. This accordingly has been attempted.

But I feel constrained to express the feeling of disappointment with which I let this new edition pass out of my hands. I had hoped it would have been my least imperfect work; but, being what it is, its publication seems to carry with it some sort of irreverence towards the great Saint in whose name and history years ago I began to write, and with whom I end. But I have done my best, bearing in mind while I write that I have no right to reckon on the future.

Febr. 2, 1881. J. H. N.

Postscript.

To the Third Edition.—As to the references in the footnotes and in the Appendix to passages translated or quoted, such references as are made to the original Greek are marked with §, and those which belong to the translation with *n*.

However, for the sake of convenience, they will sometimes be found made, not by means of a § or *n*, but by the paging.

It should moreover be added that the work "Against the Arians," which occupies the greater part of the 1st volume, is here sometimes called "Discourses" and sometimes "Orations" according as the passage is or is not English.

I may observe that the quotations from Holy Scripture remain, here as in the Oxford editions, in the Protestant version, except in cases in which the context of the passages of Athanasius, to which they severally belong, require an alteration in them:—except in such cases, a change did not seem imperative, and would have given great trouble.

To the Fourth Edition.—Also I regret that I have not been able in this new edition to prosecute in any sufficient way my intention of making the work answer the idea of a free translation. As far as I have been able to act upon it I have been aided not a little by the pains taken with its composition by Fr. William Neville of this Congregation; nor can I forget the trouble taken by Fr. Paul Eaglesim in the tiresome task of verifying my references.

May 2, 1887.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

I.

ENCYCLICAL OF ALEXANDER EXCOMMUNICATING ARIUS.

PAGE

Doctrinal Teaching of Arius 1

II.

EPISTLE OF ATHANASIUS IN DEFENCE OF THE NICENE DEFINITION OF THE HOMOÜSION.

CHAPTER I. Introductory 11

,, II. Conduct of the Arians towards the Nicene definition of the Homoüsion 14

,, III. The meaning of that word, as an appellation of our Lord 18

,, IV. Defence of its meaning 31

,, V. Defence of its definition 35

,, VI. Authorities in support of it 42

,, VII. The Arian symbol "Ingenerate" 49

APPENDIX. Eusebius's letter to his people 55

III.

EPISTLE OF ATHANASIUS CONCERNING THE ARIAN BIPARTITE COUNCIL HELD AT ARIMINUM AND SELEUCIA.

CHAPTER I. Occasion of the Two Councils 63

,, II. Proceedings of the Arians in them 70

,, III. Arian leaders 82

,, IV. Arian Creeds 91

,, V. On the Homoüsion, the Catholic Symbol 123

,, VI. On the Homœüsion, the Semi-Arian Symbol . . . 133

IV.

THREE DISCOURSES OF ATHANASIUS AGAINST THE ARIANS.

CHAPTER I. Introductory 155

,, II. Tenets of Arius 159

,, III. The Son of God uncreate and from everlasting . . . 162

		PAGE
CHAPTER	IV. Answers to intellectual objections to the doctrine: first, if the Son eternal, He existed before His birth	167
,,	V. Second: if co-eternal, then brother of the Father	171
,,	VI. Third: if a Son, He began a Theogonia . . .	176
,,	VII. Fourth: if He is a Son at all, then in subjection to the laws of a human son	183
,,	VIII. Fifth: if He is a Son at all, the titles Word and Wisdom are irrelevant	188
,,	IX. Sixth: if born at the divine will, then later than that will.	191
,,	X. Seventh: if God be the One Ingenerate, the Son is not God	204
,,	XI. Eighth: if the Son has free will, He is liable to change	211
,,	XII. Answers to objections from Scripture: first, from Phil. ii. 9, 10	214
,,	XIII. Second: Ps. xliv. 7	226
,,	XIV. Third: Heb. i. 4	234
,,	XV. Fourth: Heb. iii. 2	250
,,	XVI. Fifth: Acts ii. 36	264
,,	XVII. Sixth:	272
,,	XVIII. *continued* } introductory to Prov. viii. 22	281
,,	XIX. *continued*	289
,,	XX. *continued*	306
,,	XXI. *continued* } Prov. viii. 22	316
,,	XXII. *continued*	323
,,	XXIII. *continued*: Prov. viii. 22—30	343
,,	XXIV. Seventh: John xiv. 10	357
,,	XXV. Eighth: John xvii. 3, &c.	365
,,	XXVI. Ninth: John x. 30; xvii. 11, &c.	369
,,	XXVII. Tenth: introductory to Matth. xxviii. 18, &c., &c. .	389
,,	XXVIII. *continued*: Matth. xxviii. 18; John iii. 35 . .	401
,,	XXIX. Eleventh: Mark xiii. 32; Luke ii. 52 . . .	408
,,	XXX. Twelfth: Matth. xxvi. 39; John xii. 27, &c. . .	422

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF ALEXANDER,

ARCHBISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA,

UPON HIS DEPOSITION AND EXCOMMUNICATION OF ARIUS.

PREFATORY NOTICE.

This Epistle, which belongs to the year 321, seems to have been written by Athanasius, acting as secretary to his Archbishop, and forms a suitable introduction to his acknowledged works which follow. He was, it is true, at this date not more than twenty-five or twenty-six years old, but he seems already to have written his *Contra Gentes* and *De Incarnatione*, the two most finished of his works, and was in familiar intercourse with Alexander, and high in his esteem and confidence, if not already his Archdeacon. In consequence Tillemont goes so far as to say, "We need not doubt that St. Athanasius had a great share in the multitude of letters which at this time St. Alexander wrote on all sides to defend the faith."

Of course a vague probability, such as this, cannot determine a matter of fact, but it may fairly be adduced in order to obtain a hearing for the proper proof of it, which lies in

the style, so like Athanasius's, so unlike Alexander's. This internal evidence shall be set before the reader in the Appendix to this Volume. The text is here translated mainly from Socr. i. 6.

ENCYCLICAL,

&c.

WHEREAS the Catholic Church is one body, and we are bidden in Holy Scripture to preserve the bond of concord and peace, it is fitting that we should write and signify to each other what is happening in our own parts, so that, whether *one member suffer* or rejoice, we *all* may suffer or *rejoice with it.* Now in this our diocese at this time there have *gone forth* rebellious men and enemies of Christ, teaching an apostasy, which may reasonably be accounted and called a forerunner of Antichrist. On a matter such as this I could wish to be silent, in the hope that the evil might spend itself in the persons of the apostates, without spreading to other places and contaminating the ears of the simple; but, inasmuch as Eusebius, at this time of Nicomedia, having escaped all punishment for his covetous seizure of that see, to the abandonment of Berytus, has now proceeded, as if with him lay all matters of the Church, to place himself at the head of these apostates, and has taken upon himself to write letters all round in their favour, with the hope, by some means, of drawing men aside unawares to this last and most unchristian heresy, I have felt it a duty, knowing what is written in the Law, no longer to hold my peace, but to give you full informa-

ENCYCL. EPISTLE.

tion, in order that you may all know who they are who have apostatised, and what their miserable tenets, and may pay no attention to Eusebius, should he write to you. For, with the purpose of reviving, by means of these men, that old bad spirit, which of late had not shown itself, he pretends to defend them, but really for the furtherance of his own interests.

2. Those who have apostatised are Arius, Achillas, Aïthales, and Carpones, another Arius, Sarmates, sometime presbyters; Euzoïus, Lucius, Julian, Menas, Helladius, and Gaïus, sometime deacons; and with them Secundus and Theonas, sometime of the rank of Bishops.

3. And their unscriptural novelties are these:—"God was not always a Father, but once was not a Father. The Word of God was not always existing, but came into being out of nothing;[1] for God who is, did make out of nothing Him who was not. Therefore once He was not, for the Son is a creature and work. He is neither like in substance[2] to the Father, nor the Father's true and natural Word; nor is He His true Wisdom; but He is one of those things which were made and brought to be,[3] and only by an abuse of words,[4] Word and Wisdom, having come into existence Himself by God's own Word and God's intrinsic Wisdom, by which God made all things, and Him in their number. Accordingly He, the Word of God, is by nature mutable[5] and variable, as are all rational beings; and foreign and alien and separated off from the substance of God. And to the Son the Father is an ineffable God,[6] for not properly and accurately does the Son know the Father, nor can He perfectly see Him. For neither does the Son know His own substance, as it really is; for He was made

[1] *ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων.* Hence the Arians were called Exucontii.

[2] *ὅμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν.* Vid. Append. *Homœusion.*

[3] Vid. App. *γενητόν.*

[4] *καταχρηστικῶς.* Vid. p. 19, infr.

[5] *τρεπτός.* Vid. App. *ἄτρεπτον.*

[6] *ἀῤῥητός.*

for our sake, in order that by Him, as by an instrument, God might create us; and He would not have subsisted,[7] unless God had wished to create us." Accordingly, when they were asked whether the Word of God could change, as the devil had changed, they were not afraid to answer, "Yes, He can; for having come into being by creation, He is of a mutable nature." Ed. Ben. § 1—3.

4. These were the avowals of Arius and his followers, and when they boldly persisted in them, we together with the Bishops of Egypt and Libya, nearly a hundred in number, in Council assembled, anathematised them and their adherents. On this Eusebius and his party received them, having it at heart to confuse together falsehood with truth, and impiety with piety; but in vain, for truth ever conquers, nor is there any *communion of light with darkness, any agreement of Christ with Belial.* Who ever yet heard such language? and who that hears it now, but is shocked and stops his ears, that its foulness should not enter into them? Who that hears John saying, *In the beginning was the Word*, does not denounce the tenet, "Once He was not"? Who that hears in the gospel *the Only begotten Son*, and *by Him all things were made*, will not hate men who pronounce that "the Son is one of God's works"? How can He be on a level with His own creations? how can He be Only begotten, who, as they say, is to be numbered with all other creatures? how can He be out of nothing, when the Father says, *My heart has burst out with a good Word?* and *Out of the womb before the morning star have I borne Thee?* or how "unlike the Father in substance," if He be the perfect *Image and Radiance of the Father*, saying of Himself, *Whoso hath seen Me hath seen the Father?* And how, if the Son be God's *Word* and *Wisdom*, was He "Once not" in being? for this is as much as to say that once God was without

[7] ὑπέστη.

ENCYCL. EPISTLE.

mind, without wisdom. How, too, is He mutable, or variable, who says by His own mouth, *I am in the Father and the Father in Me*, and *I and the Father are one*; and by the mouth of His Prophet, *Behold Me, for I am and vary not.* For, though these words belong also to the Father, yet here they may be more appositely said of the Son, that in His becoming man He was not changed, but as the Apostle says is *Jesus Christ, the same yesterday to-day and for ever.* And what has persuaded them to say, that, "for our sakes He was made," though Paul writes, *For whom are all things and by whom are all things?* After so extreme a step, we need not wonder to hear their blasphemy that the Son has not perfect knowledge of the Father; for having once made up their minds to war against Christ, they put aside even His own words, *As the Father knoweth Me, even so know I the Father.* If then the Father knows the Son imperfectly, then indeed it is plain that the Son too has but an imperfect knowledge of the Father; but if to say this is a sin, and the Father knows the Son perfectly, then too, as the Father knows His own Word, so, it is plain, does the Son know His own Father whose Word He is.

5. By such arguments and explanations of divine Scripture we have oftentimes refuted them; but still, like chameleons, they changed their colours,[8] as if ambitious of fixing upon themselves the Scripture, *The wicked man when he is come into the depth of sins contemneth.*[9] Certainly many heresies have existed before them, which, venturing where they ought not, have become foolishness; but these men, scheming in all they have laid down to destroy the Word's divinity, have made those others white by the contrast of themselves, being so much more like Antichrist. Therefore it is that they have been proscribed and anathematised by the Church. Grieve, however, as

[8] p. 24 infr. [9] Prov. xviii. 3.

we do, over their ruin, and especially because, after their early grounding in the doctrines of the Church, they have now fallen away, nevertheless we are not much surprised; for a fate like this befell Hymenæus and Philetus; and before them Judas, who, once a follower of the Saviour, was afterwards a traitor and apostate. Nor have we been without lessons concerning these very persons; for the Lord foretold, *Take heed lest any man deceive you, for many shall come in My name, saying, I am He, and the time draweth near, and they shall deceive many. Go ye not after them.* And Paul, who was taught these things by the Saviour, has written that *In the last times some shall apostatise from the sound faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and teachings of demons who turn away from the truth.* ED. BEN. § 3—6.

6. Seeing then that our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ doth both by His own mouth charge us, and by the Apostle warn us concerning such men, it was fitting that we, the personal witnesses of their impiety, should anathematise them as aforesaid, declaring them aliens from the Catholic Church and faith; and we have further also made this known to your piety, our beloved and most honoured colleagues, in order that you may be on your guard against receiving any of them who may have the insolence to come to you, or giving ear to Eusebius or any other writing in their behalf. For it becomes us as Christians to turn away from all who by word and in intention blaspheme Christ, as being God's foes and destroyers of souls; nor even to say *God speed you* to such men, lest, as blessed John has charged us, we become *partakers of their sins.* Salute the brethren who are with you. Those with me give you greeting.

EPISTLE OF ATHANASIUS

IN DEFENCE OF THE NICENE DEFINITION OF THE HOMOÜSION.

PREFATORY NOTICE.

We have no means of determining the date of this Epistle, and critics do but offer conjectures at variance with each other. The Bollandists consider it to be earlier than A.D. 347, if not soon after the Nicene Council, e.g. 330 (Vit. Athan. c. 26). Montfaucon assigns some time between 350 and 354. Tillemont between 342 and 361.

Other aids towards determining it are such as these : it was written in a time of peace, after the experience and with the anticipation of persecution ; but from 325 to 330 there was no such experience, from 330 to 347 no peace, and from 352 to 361 severe persecution ; what interval is left for the date is from 348 to 352, which fulfils the requisite conditions, as being an interval of peace, with persecution before and after it.

It may be added that the rise of the Anomœans was about A.D. 350, and about the same time Acacius became the leader of the Eusebian or court party on the tactic in controversy of confining definitions of doctrine to Scripture language, and thereby virtually of annihilating dogmatic faith. Now the main topic and the occasion of this Epistle, as Athanasius shows again and again, is the revival of Arianism

proper in its original outspoken vigour, the prominence of Acacius, and the appeal to Scripture against orthodoxy by him and other successors of Eusebius.

EPISTLE OF ATHANASIUS,

&c.

Chapter I.

1. Thou hast done well, in signifying to me the discussion thou hast had with the advocates of Arianism, among whom were certain of the party of Eusebius, as well as very many of the brethren who hold the doctrine of the Church. Very welcome to me was thy Christian vigilance, which excellently confuted the impiety [1] of their heresy; while I marvelled at the effrontery which led them, after the exposures already made of their bad reasonings in the past, and of that perverse temper to which all men bore witness, still to be complaining like the Jews, "Why did the bishops at Nicæa use terms not in Scripture,[2] 'Of the substance' and 'Consubstantial'?"[3] Thou then, as a man of learning, in spite of their pretences, didst convict them of talking idly; and they in those pretences were

[1] Vid. Appendix to this volume, *εὐσέβεια*, &c.

[2] The plea here used, the unscriptural character of the Nicæan symbol, had been suggested to Constantius on his accession, A.D. 337, by the Arian priest, the favourite of Constantia, to whom Constantine had entrusted his will, Theod. Hist. ii. 3; and Eusebius of Cæsarea glances at it, at the time of the Council, in the letter to his Church, which Athanasius subjoins to this Epistle.

[3] Or Homoüsion.

CHAP. I. but acting in accordance with their own evil disposition. For they are as variable and fickle in their sentiments, as chameleons [4] in their colours; and when confuted they are confused; and when questioned they hesitate; and then they lose shame, and betake themselves to evasions. Lastly, when detected in these, they do not rest till they have invented fresh pleas which have no substance, and all this that they may persist in being loyal to an impiety.

2. Now such tactics are nothing else than an obvious token of their want of Divine Reason,[5] and a copying, as I have said, of Jewish malignity. For the Jews too, when convicted by the Truth, and unable to confront it, made excuses, such as *What miracles doest Thou, that we may see and believe Thee? What dost Thou work?* though so many miracles were given, that they themselves said, *What do we? for this man doeth many miracles?* In truth, dead men were raised, lame walked, blind saw afresh, lepers were cleansed, and the water became wine, and five loaves satisfied five thousand, and all of them wondered and worshipped the Lord, confessing that in Him were fulfilled the prophecies, and that He was God, the Son of God; all but the Pharisees, who, though the miracles shone brighter than the sun, yet complained still, as ignorant men, *Why dost Thou, being a man, make Thyself God?* Insensate, and verily blind in understanding! they ought contrariwise to have said, "Why hast Thou, being God, become man?" for His works did prove Him God, that thereupon they might both worship the Father's goodness, and admire the Son's descent from on high for our sakes. However, this they did not say; no, nor would they witness what He was doing; or they witnessed indeed, for this they could not avoid, but they changed their ground of complaint and said again, "Why healest Thou the paralytic, why makest Thou the born-blind to see, on the

[4] Vid. Appendix, *Chameleons.* [5] Vid. App. *ἀλογία.*

sabbath day?" But this too was a mere excuse and a finding fault; for on other days as well as the sabbath did the Lord heal *all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease*, but they complained still according to their wont, and in calling Him Beelzebub, preferred the imputation of Atheism,[6] to a recantation of their wickedness. And though *in sundry times and diverse manners* the Saviour thus showed His own Godhead and preached the Father to all men, nevertheless, as kicking against the goad, they rashly spoke against Him, as if in order that, according to the divine proverb, they might find *occasions for separating themselves* from the truth.[7] Ed. Ben. § 1—2.

3. As then the Jews of that day, for acting thus wickedly and denying the Lord, were with justice deprived of their laws and of the promise made to their fathers, so the Arians, judaizing now, are in my judgment in circumstances like those of Caiaphas and the contemporary Pharisees. For, perceiving that their heresy is utterly unreasonable, they start difficulties, saying, "Why was this defined and not that?" Yet wonder not though in the event they do not persevere in that sort of warfare; for in no long time they will have recourse to outrage, and will be throwing out threats of *the band and the captain*.[8] Such is their inconsistency; yet how can it be otherwise with them? for, denying the Word of God, Divine Reason they have utterly forfeited. Aware then of this, I would of myself have made no reply to their attacks; but, since thy friendliness has asked to know what was done in the Council, I have not delayed to inform you, in order to show in few words how destitute Arianism is of a religious temper, and how its very business is to frame evasions.

[6] Vid. App. ἄθεος.

[7] A reference to Prov. xviii. 1, as in the Sept. version.

[8] John xviii. 12, vid. *Use of Force*.

Chapter II.

CHAP. II. 4. And do thou, beloved, consider whether it be not so. If, the devil having sown their hearts[9] with this perverseness, they are so confident in the truth of their reasonings, why do they not first clear themselves of the charge of heresy which lies against them? and then will come the time for them to criticise the definition[1] of the Council. For no one, on being convicted of murder or adultery, is at liberty after the trial to arraign the sentence of the judge, why he spoke in this way and not in that. For this, instead of exculpating the convict, rather increases his crime on the score of petulance and audacity. Why did not they find fault with the wording of the definition at the time when it was framed? but now when their first duty is to repeat after the Council those anathemas in which its creed ends, instead of this, they profess to have scruples as to the creed itself, and they find matter for a subterfuge in the fact, which no one denies, that the word "substance" is not in Scripture. Surely it is just that those who are under a charge should confine themselves to their own defence. While their own conscience is so unclean, they are not quite the men to quarrel with an act which in truth they do not understand. Rather, let them investigate the matter in a docile spirit, and, in order to learn what hitherto they had not known, let them cleanse their ears in the stream of truth and the doctrine of piety.

5. Now it happened to the Eusebians in the Nicene Council in this wise:—On their making a stand in behalf of their impiety, the assembled bishops, who were more or less three hundred in number, mildly and courteously called

[9] ἐπισπείραντος τοῦ διαβόλου, the allusion is to Matt. xiii. 25, and is very frequent in Athan. chiefly with a reference to Arianism. Vid. App. ἐπισπειρας.

[1] Vid. *Definition.*

upon them to explain and defend themselves. Ed. Ben. § 2—3. Scarcely, however, did they begin to speak, when they pronounced their own condemnation,[2] for one differed from another; then, perceiving the serious straits in which their heresy lay, they remained dumb, and by their silence confessed the disgrace which came upon them. On this the Bishops, after condemning the formulæ which they had devised, published against them the sound and ecclesiastical faith; and, whereas all subscribed it, the Eusebians subscribed it too in those very phrases, of which they are now complaining, (I mean, "Of the substance," and "Consubstantial,") professing that "the Son of God is neither creature nor work, nor in the number of things made from nothing, but that the Word is an Offspring from the substance of the Father." And, what is strange indeed, Eusebius of Cæsarea in Palestine, who had refused the day before, yet afterwards subscribed, and sent to his church a letter, saying that this was the Church's faith and the tradition of the Fathers; and thereby made it clear to all that his party were in error before, and were rashly contending against the truth. For, though he was ashamed at the moment to adopt these phrases, and excused himself to his Church in his own way, yet he certainly means to signify his acceptance of them, in that he does not in his Epistle deny the "One in substance," and "Consubstantial." And in this way he got into a difficulty; for, in excusing himself, he thereby was attacking the Arians, as if their stating that "the Son was not before His generation," was their denial of His existence even before His birth in the flesh. And Acacius too knows this well, though he also through fear may pretend otherwise because of the times, and may deny the fact. Accordingly I have sub-

[2] i. e. "convicted *themselves*," infr. p. 35, Ep. Æg. § 6, ἑαυτῶν ἀεὶ κατήγοροι, i.e. by their variations, vid. Tit. iii. 11, αὐτοκατάκριτος.

CHAP. II. joined at the end of these remarks the letter of Eusebius, that thou mayst know from it the scanty regard shown by Christ's enemies[3] towards their own masters, and singularly by Acacius himself.

6. Are they not then committing a crime, in their very thought to gainsay the decree of so great and ecumenical a Council? are they not in transgression, when they dare to confront that good definition against Arianism, acknowledged, as it was, by those who had in the first instance taught them their impiety? And supposing, even after subscription, Eusebius and his did change again, and return like *dogs to their own vomit* of impiety, then surely the present gainsayers do but deserve still greater detestation, for they are sacrificing their souls' liberty to those, as the masters of their heresy, who are, as James has said, *double-minded men, and unstable in all their ways*, not having one opinion, but changing to and fro, and now recommending certain statements, but soon dishonouring them, and in turn recommending what just now they were blaming. But this, as the Shepherd[4] has said, is to be "the child of the devil," and is the note of hucksters rather than of doctors. For, what our Fathers have of old delivered, this is really doctrine; and this truly the token of doctors, to confess the same thing with each other, and to vary neither from themselves nor from their fathers; whereas they who have not this character are not to be called true doctors but charlatans. Thus the Greeks, as not witnessing to the same doctrines, but quarrelling one with another, have no truth of teaching;[5] but the holy and veritable heralds of the truth agree together, not differ. For though they lived in different times, yet they one and all tend the same way, being prophets of the one God, and preaching the same Word harmoniously.

[3] Vid. χριστόμαχος.
[4] Hermas, Pastor, ii. 9.
[5] Vid. *Private Judgment.*

7. And thus what Moses taught, that Abraham kept; and what Abraham kept, that Noe and Enoch acknowledged, discriminating pure from impure, and becoming acceptable to God. For Abel too in this way witnessed unto death, taught in the truths which he had learned from Adam, who himself had learned from the Lord, and He again, when He came in the last age for the abolishment of sin, said, *I give no new commandment unto you.* Wherefore also the blessed Apostle Paul, who had learnt it from Him, when he is determining ecclesiastical duties, forbade that even deacons, not to say bishops, should be *double-tongued;* and in his rebuke of the Galatians, he made a broad declaration, *If any one preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be anathema. As I have said, so say I again; if even an Angel from Heaven should preach unto you any other Gospel than that ye have received, let him be anathema.* ED. BEN. § 3—6.

8. Thus the Apostle.[6] If then truth lay,[7] as the Eusebians afterwards said, otherwise than their subscription implied, the present men ought to anathematise them for subscribing; if on the other hand they subscribed to a truth, what ground have they of complaint against the great Council which imposed on them the subscription? But if they blame the Council's act, yet let off those who took part in it, they are themselves too plainly the sport of every wind and wave, and are influenced by opinions, not their own, but of others, and being such, are as little trustworthy now as before, in what they allege. Rather let them cease to carp at what they understand not; lest so it be that, not knowing to discriminate, they at hazard call evil

[6] Vid. *Apostle.*

[7] There seems to be some error in the text here, over and above the (perhaps) error of the press, *παρὰ τὰ ὑπέγραψαν.* It is here translated as if *καλὰ* was understood or accidentally omitted:—*ἢ καὶ οὗτοι τοὺς περὶ Εὐσέβιον μεταβαλλομένους καὶ λέγοντας ἕτερα* [*καλὰ*] *παρ' ἃ ὑπέγραψαν, ἀνάθεμα ποιείτωσαν, ἤ,* &c.

CHAP. III. good and good evil, and think that bitter is sweet and sweet bitter. Doubtless their real desire is that doctrines which have already been judged wrong and have been reprobated should gain the ascendancy, and they make violent efforts to prejudice what was rightly defined. Nor is there reason for further explanation on our part or answer to their excuses, nor for further resistance on theirs, instead of acquiescence in what the leaders of their heresy subscribed; but since, from an extraordinary want of modesty, the present men perhaps hope to be able to advocate an impiety, which really is from the Evil One,[8] with better success than those who went before them, therefore, though in my former letter written to thee,[9] I have already argued at length against them, notwithstanding, I am ready now also to examine each of their separate statements, as I did those of their predecessors; for now not less than then their heresy shall be shown to have no soundness in it, but to be a *doctrine of demons*.

CHAPTER III.

9. THEY say then what the others held and dared to maintain before them:[1] "Not always Father, always Son; for the Son was not before His generation, but, as others, came out of nothing; and in consequence God was not always Father of the Son; but when the Son came into being

[8] Vid. διαβολικός.

[9] This letter is not extant.

[1] It may be convenient to set down here the anathematisms appended to the Nicene Creed, though they occur presently in Eusebius's Letter. They run thus: "And as to those who say that the Son once was not; and that before His generation He was not; and that He came into being from nothing; or who pretend that He was of another hypostasis or substance, or that the Son of God was created, or alterable, or mutable, those men the Holy Catholic and Apostolical Church anathematises."

and was created, then was God called His Father. For the Word is a creature and work, and foreign and unlike to the Father in substance; and the Son is neither by nature the Father's true Word, nor His only and true Wisdom; but being a creature and one of the works, He is by an abuse of words[2] called Word and Wisdom; for by the Word which is in God was He made, as were all things. Wherefore the Son is not true God."[3] Ed. Ben. § 5—6.

10. Now it may serve to bring home to them what they are saying, to ask them first this, what a son simply is, and of what is that name significant. In truth, Divine Scripture acquaints us with a double sense of this word:—one which Moses sets before us in the Law, *When thou shalt hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, to keep all His commandments which I command thee this day, to do that which is right in the eyes of the Lord thy God, ye shall be children of the Lord your God;* as also in the Gospel, John says, *But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God:*—and the other sense is that in which Isaac is son of Abraham, and Jacob of Isaac, and the Patriarchs of Jacob. Now in which of these two senses, literal or figurative, do they understand the Son of God in such figments as the foregoing? for I feel sure they will issue in the same impiety as the Eusebians.

11. First, let us suppose the word Son to be taken in the figurative, not the literal sense; and this is how they really understand it (as their predecessors did), only many of them shrink from saying so. If this is the sense in

[2] καταχρηστικῶς. This word is noticed and protested against by Alexander, supr. p. 4, by the Semiarians at Ancyra, Epiph. Hær. 73, n. 5, by Basil, contr. Eunom. ii. 23, and by Cyril, Dial. ii. pp. 432, 433. Also Cyril Cat. xi. 4, Epiph. Hær. 69, p. 743, and 71, p. 831; Euseb. c. Marc. p. 40, Concil Labb. t. 2, p. 67, and abusivè, p. 210.

[3] Vid. ad Ep. Æg. § 12, supr. p. 4, infr. Disc. ch. 5, p. 160.

CHAP. III. which the title "Son of God" is to be taken, then I observe, first of all, that sonship in this sense is a grace gained from above by those who have made progress in goodness, and who receive *power to become sons of God;* and then, if so, He would surely in nothing differ from us, who are also born of God; no, nor would He be Only-begotten, as having obtained the title of Son, as others have, from His virtue. For granting what they say, that, whereas His qualifications were foreknown, He, on that account, from His very first beginning, by anticipation, received the name, and the glory of the name, still there will be no difference between Him and those who receive the name for their actions, so long as this is the ground on which He as others is recognised as Son. For Adam too, though he received grace from the first, and upon his creation was at once placed in paradise, differed in no respect either from Enoch, who was translated thither after his birth on his pleasing God, or from the Apostle, who also was caught up to paradise after his good actions; nay, nor from the thief, who, by virtue of his confession, received a promise that he should be forthwith in paradise.

12. Next when thus pressed, they will perhaps make an answer which has brought them into difficulty many times already: "We consider that the Son has this prerogative over other beings, and therefore is called Only-begotten, because He alone was brought into being by God alone, and all other things were created by God through the Son." Now I wonder who it was that suggested to you[4] so futile and novel an idea as that the Father alone wrought with His own hand the Son alone, and that all

[4] i.e. what is your *authority?* is it not a *novel*, and therefore a wrong doctrine? And presently *μαθὼν ἐδίδασκεν*, implying the traditional nature of the teaching. And so St. Paul himself, 1 Cor. xv. 3. Vid. also supr. pp. 17, 23. infr. p. 65, Serap. i. § 3.

other things were brought into being by the Son as by an under-worker. If for the toil-sake God was content with making the Son only, instead of making all things at once, this is an impious thought, especially in the case of those who know the words of Esaias, *The everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, hungereth not, neither is weary; there is no searching of His understanding.* Rather it is He who to the hungry gives strength, and through His word refreshes the labouring. On the other hand it is impious to suppose that He disdained, as if a humble task, Himself to form the creatures which came into being after the Son; for there is no pride in that God, who goes down with Jacob into Egypt, and for Abraham's sake corrects Abimelec in behalf of Sara, and speaks face to face with Moses, who was but a man, and descends upon Mount Sinai, and by His secret grace fights for the people against Amalec. However, you are false in your fact, for we are told, *He made us, and not we ourselves.* He it is that, through His Word, made all things small and great, and we may not divide the creation, and say this is the Father's, and this is the Son's, but all things are of one God, who uses His proper Word as a Hand,[5] and in Him does all things. As God Himself shows us, when He says, *All these things hath My Hand made;* and Paul taught us as he had been taught, that *There is One God, from whom are all things; and One Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things.* Thus He, always as now, speaks to the sun and it rises, and commands the clouds and it rains upon one place, and another, where it does not rain, is dried up. And He bids the earth to give its fruit, and fashions Jeremias in the womb. But if He now does all this, assuredly at the beginning also He did not disdain through the Word to make all things Himself; for these are but parts of the whole.

ED. BEN. § 7.

[5] Vid. *Hand.*

CHAP. III.

13. But now, thirdly, let us suppose, as sometimes has been said, that the other creatures could not endure to be wrought by the direct[6] Hand of the Ingenerate, and therefore the Son alone was brought into being by the Father alone, and other things by the Son as an underworker and assistant, for this is what Asterius[7] the sacrificer has written, and what Arius has transcribed and bequeathed to his own friends; and from that time they used this formula, broken reed as it is, being ignorant, the bewildered men, of its rottenness. For if it was impossible for things created to bear the hand of God, and you hold the Son to be one of their number, how was even He equal to this formation by God alone? and if an intermediate was necessary that things that came into being might come, and you hold the Son to be one of such, then must there have been some medium before Him, for His own creation; and, that intermediate himself again being a creature, it follows that he too needed another Mediator for his own framing. And though we were to devise another, we must still first devise his Mediator, so that we shall never come to an end. And thus a Mediator being ever in request, never would the creation be constituted, because nothing that has come into being can, as you say, bear the direct hand of the Ingenerate. And if, on your perceiving the extravagance of this, you begin to say that the Son, though a creature, was made capable of being made immediately by the Ingenerate, then all the other things also, though they are mere creatures, are capable of being framed immediately by the Ingenerate; for the Son too is but a creature in your judgment, as everything else. And consequently the generation of the Word is superfluous, according to your impious and futile imagination,

[6] ἄκρατος, simple, absolute, untempered, vid. *Arian arguments.*

[7] Vid. *Asterius.*

God being sufficient for the immediate formation of all things, and all things that have been brought out of nothing being capable of sustaining His direct hand. Ed. Ben § 8—9.

14. These impious men then having so little mind amid their madness, let us see, fourthly, whether this particular sophism will not prove even more irrational than the others. Adam was created alone by God alone (through the Word); yet no one would say that Adam differed from those who came after him in having thereby something in his nature more than all other men (granting that he alone was made by God alone, and that we all spring from Adam and consist by succession of our race) so long as we consider him fashioned from the earth as others, and that, at first not existing, he afterwards came to be. But though we were to allow some prerogative to the Protoplast as having been formed by the very Hand of God, still it must be accounted to him as one of honour, not of nature. For he came of the earth, as all other men; and the Hand which then fashioned Adam, now also and ever is fashioning and giving entire consistence to those who come after him. And God Himself declares this to Jeremias, as I said before: *Before I formed thee in the womb, I knew thee;* and so He says of all, *All those things hath My hand made;* and again by Esaias, *Thus saith the Lord, thy Redeemer, and He that formed thee from the womb; I am the Lord that maketh all things, that stretcheth forth the heavens alone, that spreadeth abroad the earth by Myself.* And David, knowing this, says in the Psalm, *Thy Hands have made me and fashioned me;* and he who says in Esaias, *Thus saith the Lord who formed me from the womb to be His servant,* signifies the same. Therefore, in respect of nature, he differs nothing from us though he precedes us in time, so long as we all consist and are created by the same Hand. If then these be your thoughts, O Arians, about the Son of God also. that thus He subsists and came to be, then in

CHAP. III. your judgment He will differ nothing on the score of nature from others, supposing He too once was not, and then was brought into being, and the name of Son was, on His creation, for His virtue's sake, by grace united to Him. For, from what you say, He Himself is one of those of whom the Spirit says in the Psalms, *He spake the word and they were made; He commanded and they were created.* If so, who was it to whom God gave command for the Son's creation? for a Word there must be to whom God *gave command*,[8] and in whom the works are *created;* but ye have no other to show than the Word whom ye deny, unless indeed you should again devise some new notion.

15. "Yes," they will say, "we have found another;" (which indeed I have formerly heard from the Eusebians,) "on this score do we consider that the Son of God has a prerogative over others, and is called Only-begotten, because He alone partakes the Father, and all other things partake the Son." Thus they weary themselves in changing and varying their statements, like so many pigments; however, this shall not save them from an exposure, as men who speak empty words *out of the earth*, and wallow as if in the mire of their own devices. For if indeed He were called God's Son, and we the Son's sons, their fiction were plausible; but if we too are said to be sons of that God, of whom He is Son, then we too partake the Father, who says, *I have begotten and exalted children.* For, if we did not partake Him, He had not said, *I have begotten;* but, if He Himself begat us, no other than He is our Father.[9] And, as before, it avails not, whether the Son has something more and was made first, whereas we have something less and were made afterwards, as long as we all partake, and are called sons, of the same Father. For the more or less does not indicate a different nature;[9]

[8] Vid. *Ministration.*

[9] Vid. γεννητόν.

but attaches to each according to the practice of virtue; and one is placed over ten cities, another over five; and some sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel; and others hear the words, *Come, ye blessed of My Father*, and, *Well done, good and faithful servant.* With these ideas, however, no wonder they imagine that of such a Son God was not always Father, and that such a Son was not always in existence, but was brought into being from nothing, as a creature, and was not before His generation; for such a one is other than the True Son of God. Ed. Ben. § 9—10.

16. But to persist in thus speaking involves guilt; for it is the tone of thought of Sadducees, and of Samosatene[1] to consider that the Word and Wisdom of the Father is but His Son by grace and adoption: it remains then to say that He is Son in the second of the senses above specified, viz., not by an extreme figure, but in a literal sense, as Isaac was son of Abraham as being begotten of him. In other words, the Son is of the nature of the Father,[2] for nature and nothing short of nature is implied in the idea of sonship, generation, or derivation. A son is a father's increase, not acquisition; from within not from without. I know the objection which will be made to this doctrine; it will be said that I have proposed a mere human conception

[1] Paul of Samosata is called Samosatene, as John of Damascus Damascene, from the frequent adoption of the names Paul and John. Hence, also, John Chrysostom, Peter Chrysologus, John Philoponus. Paul was Bishop of Antioch in the middle of the third century, and was deposed for a sort of Sabellianism. He was the friend of Lucian, from whose school the principal Arians issued. His prominent tenet, to which Athan. seems here to refer, was that our Lord became the Son by προκοπή, or growth in holiness (vid. Luke ii. 52, προέκοπτε), "advancing as a man." Or Athan. may be comparing our Lord's predestination as held by the Arians (supr. p. 20. Theod. Hist. i. 3, p. 732), with Paul's speaking of Him as "God predestined before ages, but from Mary receiving the origin of His existence." Apoll. i. § 20.

[2] Vid. *Son of God.*

CHAP III. of a sacred truth, altogether earthly and utterly unworthy of God, but I cannot accept such an account of it. Such an objection only argues ignorance in those who make it; for analogy does not involve likeness. Spirit is not as body, God is not as man, nor man as God. Men are created of matter, and their substance is liable to increase and loss; but God is immortal and incorporeal. And if so be the same terms are used of God and of man in divine Scripture, yet the clear-sighted, as Paul injoins, will study its text and thereby discriminate, and dispose of what is written there according to the nature of each subject, and will avoid any confusion of sense, so as not to conceive of the attributes of God in a human way, nor again to ascribe the properties of man to God. For this were to mix wine with water, and to place upon the altar strange fire together with that which is divine.

17. For instance, God creates, and man too is said to create, and God has being, and men too are said to be. Yet does God create as man does? or has He being as man has being? Perish the thought; we understand the terms in one sense of God, and in another of men. For God creates in that He calls into being that which is not, needing nothing thereunto: but men create by working some existing material, first praying, and thereby gaining the science to execute from that God who has framed all things by His proper Word. And again, men, being incapable of self-existence, are inclosed in place, and have their consistence in the Word of God; but God is self-existent, inclosing all things, and inclosed by none;[3] within all according to His own goodness and power, yet without all in His proper nature. As then men create not as God creates, as their being is not such as God's being, so men's generation is in one way, and the Son is from the Father in another. For the offsprings of men are

[3] Vid. *Omnipresence.*

in some sort portions of their fathers, since the very nature of bodies is to be compounded and dissoluble,[4] and to act by piecemeal; and men lose their substance in begetting,[5] and again they gain substance from the accession of food. And on this account men in their time become fathers of many children; but God, who is individual, is Father of the Son without being parted or affected, for there is neither loss nor gain to the Immaterial, as there is in the case of men, and, being simple in His nature, He gives absolutely and utterly all that He is, and thereby is Father of One Only Son. This is why the Son is Only-begotten, and alone in the Father's bosom, and alone is acknowledged by the Father to be from Him, as in the words, *This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.* And therefore also, He is the Father's Word,[6] a title which suggests that the Divine Nature is beyond liability to affection and division, in that not even a human word is begotten with any such accidents, much less the Word of God. Wherefore, also, He sits, as Word, at the Father's right hand; for where the Father is, there also is His Word; but we, as being His works, stand in judgment before Him; and He is adored, because He is Son of the adorable Father, but we adore, confessing Him Lord and God, because we are creatures and other than He.

18. If this be so, we come to this question:—supposing by the appellation of Son of God must be meant God's offspring, the fulness of His very Self, can it be a light sin, to maintain that He was made out of nothing, and was not before His generation? It is of course a subject which transcends the thoughts of men, but, I repeat, God's nature is not bound by the conditions of ours. We become fathers of our children in time, but God, in that He ever is, is ever Father of His Son.[7] And the generation of

[4] Vid. ῥευστός.
[5] Vid. ἀποῤῥοή.
[6] Vid. λόγος.
[7] Vid. ἀειγεννές.

CHAP. III. mankind is familiarised to us from earthly instances that are parallel; but since *no one knoweth the Son but the Father, and no one knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him*, therefore the sacred writers, to whom the Son has revealed Him, have given us a sort of image, but nothing more, from things visible, saying, *Who is the brightness of His glory and the impress of His Person;* and again, *For with Thee is the well of life, and in Thy light shall we see light;* and when the Word chides Israel, He says, *Thou hast forsaken the Fountain of wisdom;* and this Fountain it is which says, *They have forsaken Me, the Fountain of living waters.* And mean indeed and very dim is the illustration compared with what we desiderate; but yet it is possible from it to understand something above man's nature,[8] instead of thinking the Son's generation to be on a level with ours. For instance, who can even imagine that the radiance of light "once was not," so that he should dare to say that "the Son was not always," or that "the Son was not before His generation"? or who is capable of separating the radiance from the sun, or of conceiving of the Fountain as ever void of life, that he should say, even if mad, "The Son is from nothing," (who says Himself, *I am the life*), or "alien to the Father's substance," (who says, *He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father?*) for the sacred writers wishing us thus to understand, have given these illustrations; and it is irrelevant and most impious, when Scripture contains such images, to form ideas concerning our Lord from others which are neither in Scripture, nor have any pious bearing.

19. Let us go by Scripture; then from what teacher or by what tradition have you derived these notions about the Saviour? From what passages of Scripture? "Yes," they will say, "in the Proverbs we read, *The Lord hath*

[8] Vid. *Economical language*

created Me a beginning of His ways unto His works.[9] This the Eusebians used to insist upon in former years, and you write me word that the present men also, though overthrown and confuted by an abundance of proof, still are putting about in every quarter this passage, and saying that the Son is one of the creatures, and reckoning Him with things which came into being out of nothing. But I answer first, it cannot mean this, supposing we have already proved Him to be a Son. Son and creature are ideas incompatible with each other. If then Son, therefore not creature: if creature, not Son: for vast is the difference between them, and Son and creature cannot be the same, unless His substance be considered to be at once from God and yet external to God. This at first sight; but, secondly, these men seem to me to have a wrong understanding of this passage. They ask us again and again, like so many noisy gnats,[1] "Has the passage no meaning?" Yes, it has a meaning, a pious and very orthodox meaning, but not theirs, and had they understood it, they would not have blasphemed the *Lord of glory*. It is true to say that the Son was created, but this took place when He became man; for creation belongs to man. And any one may find this sense duly conveyed in the divine oracles, who, instead of accounting their perusal a secondary matter, investigates the time and persons, and the purpose, and thus studies and ponders what he reads. Now as to the season spoken of, he will find for certain that, whereas the Lord always exists, at length in fulness of the ages He became man; and whereas He is Son of God, He

[9] Eusebius of Nicomedia quotes this text. Theod. Hist. i. 5. And Eusebius of Cæsarea Dem. Evang. v. 1. It is the one subject of Disc. chapt. 17—23, infr. pp. 272—356.

[1] *περιβομβοῦσιν.* So ad Afros. § 5, init. And Sent. D. § 19 *περίερχονται περιβομβοῦντες*, and Disc. i. ch. 9, init. And Gregory Nyssen, contra Eun. viii. p. 234, C. *ὥς ἄν τοὺς ἀπείρους τούτων ταῖς πλατωνικαῖς καλλιφωνίαις περιβομβήσειεν.* Also Naz. Orat. 27. 2.

CHAP. III. became Son of man also. And as to the need he will understand that, wishing to annul our death, He took on Himself a body from the Virgin Mary; in order that, by offering this unto the Father a sacrifice for all, He might deliver us all, who by fear of death were *all our life through subject to bondage.* And as to the person, this is indeed the Saviour's, but it is then said of Him when He took a body and said, *The Lord has created Me a beginning of His ways unto His works.* For as it properly belongs to Him, as God's Son, to be everlasting, and to be in the Father's bosom, so, on His becoming man, the words befitted Him, *The Lord created Me.* For then they are said of Him, and then He hungered, and thirsted, and asked where Lazarus lay, and suffered, and rose again. And as, when we hear of Him as Lord and God and true Light, we understand Him as being from the Father, so on hearing *The Lord created*, and *Servant*, and *He suffered*, we shall justly ascribe this, not to His Godhead, for it does not belong to It, but we must interpret it of that flesh which He bore for our sakes; for to it these things are proper, and this flesh itself was none other's than the Word's. And if we wish to know the advantages we attain by this, we shall find them to be as follows: that the Word was made flesh, not only to offer up this body for all, but that we, partaking of His Spirit, might be made gods, a gift which we could not otherwise have gained than by His clothing Himself in our created body; for hence we derive our name of "men of God" and "men in Christ." And as we, by receiving the Spirit, do not lose our own proper substance, so the Lord, when made man for us, and bearing a body, was no less God; for He was not lessened by the envelopment of the body, but rather deified it and rendered it immortal.

Chapter IV.

20. This then is quite enough in order to denounce as infamous this Arian heresy; for, as the Lord —— has granted, out of their own words is impiety brought home to them. But now let us on our part act on the offensive, and call on them for an answer; for it is fair time, when their own ground has failed them, to question them on ours; perhaps it may abash the perverse, and make them see whence they have fallen. It has been shown above that the appellation "Son" is so far from implying beginning of existence as actually to suggest co-existence and co-eternity and co-divinity with God the Father. But, besides this, I have incidentally referred to the passages in Holy Scripture which speak of our Lord as the Divine Word and Wisdom, and the meaning of these titles, when carefully considered, is a confirmation that He is truly and literally the Son. The Apostle, for instance, says, *Christ the Power of God and the Wisdom of God;* and John after saying, *and the Word was made flesh*, at once adds, *And we have seen His glory the glory as of the Only-begotten of the Father full of grace and truth;* so that, the Word being the Only-begotten Son, is also that Power and that Wisdom by which heaven and earth and all that is therein were made. In like manner we have learnt from Baruch that Wisdom comes from a Fountain,[2] and that that Fountain is God; what then is Wisdom but His Son? Now, if they deny Scripture, they are at once aliens from the Christian name, and may fitly be called of all men atheists, and Christ's enemies, for they have brought upon themselves these titles. But if they agree with us that the sayings of Scripture are divinely inspired, let them dare to say openly what they think in secret, that the Word and Wisdom being the Son, the Word

Ed. Ben. § 14—15.

[2] Vid. πηγή.

CHAP. IV. and Wisdom of the Father had a beginning, that is, that God was once wordless and wisdomless; and let them in their madness say, "There was once when He was not," and "before His generation, Christ was not;" and again let them declare that the Fountain begat not Wisdom from Itself, but acquired It from without, till they have the daring to say, "The Son came of nothing;" whence it will follow that His origin is no longer a Fountain, but a sort of pool, as if merely receiving water from without, and usurping the name of Fountain.

21. How full of impiety this is, I consider none can doubt who has ever so little understanding; however, they shall be answered as Arius was, and as I noticed when I began. They whisper something about titles, Word and Wisdom are titles of the Son, only titles;[3] titles! then what is His real name? What is He really? is He more than those titles, or less than them? If He is greater than the titles, it is not lawful from the lesser to designate the higher, but, if He be in His own nature less than the titles, then it follows that He has earned what is higher than His original self, and this implies in Him a moral advance, which is an impiety equal to anything that has gone before. For that He who is in the Father, and in whom also the Father is, who says, *I and the Father are one*, whom *he that hath seen, hath seen the Father*, to imply, I say, by the titles you give Him that He has been improved by anything external, is the extreme of madness.

22. However, when they are beaten hence, and like the old Eusebians are in these great straits, then they have this remaining plea, which Arius too in ballads, and in his own Thalia, fabled, starting it as a new difficulty: "Many words speaketh God; which then of these are we to call Son and Word, Only-begotten of the Father?" Insensate, and anything but Christians! for first, in using

[3] Vid. *ὀνόματα.*

such language about God, they are not far from conceiving of Him as a man, who speaks and then modifies His first words by His second, just as if one Word from God were not sufficient for the framing of all things at the Father's will, and for His providential care of all. For His speaking many words would argue a feebleness in them all, each needing the service of the other. But that God should act through One Word, which is the true doctrine, both shows the power of God, and the perfection of the Word that is from Him, and the pious understanding of them who thus believe. Ed. Ben. § 16—17

23. O that they would be led to confess the truth from these their own admissions now! how near they come to it, in order to start off again in hopeless divergence! They grant that "many words speaketh God," and what is such utterance but in some sort a bringing forth? He is a Father of words; then why not in that way which is most perfect? why not rather the Father of One Word than of many?—of a Word substantive and from His own fulness rather than of mere utterances[4] which come and go and have no stay? These men are loth to say that there is no substantial Word of God, why then do they not go on to confess that that Word is a Son also? Is Son a mere title without substance? and must not also that Word be a reflection or image? and, as God is One, is not His Image substantive and one? and who is that but the One Son? All these appellations look to one Object, and each of them subserves the rest. For the Son of God, as may be learnt from the divine oracles themselves, is Himself the Word of God, and the Wisdom, and the Image, and the Hand, and the Power; for God's Offspring is One, and of the generation from the Father these titles are tokens.[5] If you say the Son, you have declared what is from the Father by nature; and if you imagine the Word, you are

[4] Vid. *Economical language.*

[5] Vid. App. *The Word*, p. 337.

CHAP. 4. thinking again of what is from Him, and what is inseparable; and speaking of Wisdom, again you mean in like manner, what is not from without, but from Him and in Him; and if you name the Power and the Hand, again you speak of what is proper to the substance; and, speaking of the Image, you signify the Son; for what else is like God but the Offspring from Him? Doubtless the things which came into being through *the Word*, these are *founded in Wisdom;* and what are *founded in Wisdom*, these are all made by the *Hand*, and came to be through the Son.

24. And we have proof of this, not from adventitious authorities, but from the Scriptures; for God Himself says by Esaias the Prophet, *My Hand also hath laid the foundation of the earth, and My right Hand hath spanned the heavens.* And again, *And I have covered them in the shadow of My Hand, that I may plant the heavens and lay the foundations of the earth.* And David being taught this, and knowing that the Lord's Hand was nothing else than Wisdom, says in the Psalm, *In Wisdom hast Thou made them all; the earth is full of Thy riches.* Solomon also received the same from God, and said, *The Lord by Wisdom hath founded the earth;* and John knowing that the Word was the Hand and the Wisdom, thus preaches the gospel, *In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God; the same was in the beginning with God: all things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made.* And the Apostle, understanding that the Hand and the Wisdom and the Word was nothing else than the Son, says *God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the Fathers by the Prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son, whom He hath appointed Heir of all things, by whom also He made the ages.* And again, *There is One Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through Him.* And knowing also that the Word, the Wisdom, the Son was the Image Himself of the Father, he says

in the Epistle to the Colossians, *Giving thanks to God and the Father which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light, who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of His dear Son; in whom we have redemption, even the remission of sins; who is the Image of the Invisible God the First-born of every creature; for by Him were all things created, that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by Him and for Him: and He is before all things, and in Him all things consist.* Ed. Ben. § 17—18.

25. For as all things are created by the Word, so, because He is the Image,[6] are they also created in Him. And thus a man who directs his thoughts to the Lord will be saved from stumbling upon the stone of offence, and will go forward to that illumination which streams from the light of truth; for this is really the sentiment of piety, though these contentious men burst with spite, neither devout towards God, nor abashed by the arguments which confute them.

Chapter V.

26. Now the Eusebians were at that former time examined at great length, and passed sentence on themselves, as I said before; on this they subscribed; and after this change of mind they kept in quiet and retirement; but since the present party, in the wantonness of impiety, and in their wild vagaries about the truth, are full set upon accusing the Council, let them tell us, I repeat, what is the sort of Scriptures from which they have learned, or who is the Saint by whom they have been taught, to heap together

[6] Vid. *Image.*

CHAP. V. their phrases, "Out of nothing," and "He was not before His generation," and "Once He was not," and "Alterable," and the "Pre-existence," and "At God's will;" which are their fables in mockery of the Lord. Considering then that they on their part have made use of phrases not in Scripture,[7] and that with a view thereby of expressing impious notions, it does not become them to find fault with those who for a pious purpose go beyond Scripture. Disguise it as you will by artful terms and plausible sophisms, impiety is a sin; but represent the truth under ever so strange a formula, while it is truth, it at least is piety. That what these Christ-opposers advanced was impious falsehood, I have proved both now and formerly; that what the Council defined was pious truth is equally clear, as will be granted by any careful inquirer into the occasion of the definition. It was as follows:—

27. The Council wishing to condemn the impious phrases of the Arians, and to use instead the received terms of Scripture, namely, that the Son is not from nothing, but *from God*, and is the *Word* and *Wisdom* and not a creature or work, but the proper Offspring from the Father, the party of Eusebius, out of their inveterate heterodoxy, understood the phrase *from God* as common to Him and to us, as if in respect to it the Word of God differed nothing from us, and this, because it is written, *There is One God from whom all things;* and again, *Old things are passed away, behold all things are new, and all things are from God.* But the Fathers, perceiving their craft and the cunning of their impiety, were forced thereupon to express more distinctly the sense of the words *from God.* Accordingly, they wrote "from the substance of God," in order that *from God* might not be considered common and equal in the Son and in things which are made, but that all others might be acknowledged as creatures, and the Word

[7] Vid. *Scripture.*

alone as from the Father. For though all things be said to be from God,[8] yet this is not in the sense in which the Son is from Him; for as to the creatures, "*from God*" is said of them, in that they exist not at random or spontaneously, nor come into being by chance, according to those philosophers who refer them to the combination of atoms, and to elements which are homogeneous, nor as certain heretics imagine some other Framer, nor as others again say that the constitution of all things is from certain Angels; not for these reasons, but because, whereas there is a God, it was by Him that all things were brought into being, when as yet they were not, through His Word; and as to the Word, since He is not a creature, He alone is really, as well as is called, *from the Father;* and this is signified, when it is said that the Son is "from the substance of the Father," for to no creature does this attach. In truth, when Paul says that *all things are from God*, he immediately adds, *and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom all things*, by way of showing all men that the Son is other than all those things which came into being from God,[9] (for as to the things which came from God, it was through the Son that they came); and he used the words which I have quoted with reference to the world as framed by God, and not as if all things proceeded from the Father as the Son does. For neither are other things as the Son is, nor is the Word one among those other, for He is Lord and Framer of all; and on this account did the Holy Council declare expressly that He was of the substance of the Father, that we might believe the Word to be other in nature than things which have a beginning, as being alone truly from God; and that no subterfuge should be left open to the impious. This then was the reason why the Council wrote "Of the substance."

ED. BEN. § 18–20.

28. Again, when the Bishops said that the Word must

[8] Vid. γεννητόν. [9] Vid. μονογενής.

CHAP. V. be described as the True Power and image of the Father as the exact Likeness[1] of the Father in all things, and as unalterable, and as always, and as in Him without division; (for never was the Word not in being, but He was always existing everlastingly with the Father, as the radiance of light), then the party of Eusebius endured it indeed, as not daring to contradict, being put to shame by the arguments which were urged against them; but withal they were caught whispering to each other and winking with their eyes, that "like" and "always," and "the attribute of power," and "in Him," were, as before, common to us and to the Son, and that it was no difficulty to agree to these statements. As to "like," they said that it is written of us, *Man is the image and glory of God;* "always," that it was written, *For we which live are always;* "In God," *In Him we live and move and have our being;* "unalterable," that it is written, *Nothing shall separate us from the love of Christ;* as to "power," that even the caterpillar and the locust are called *power* and *great power*, and that it is often said of the people, for instance, *All the power of the Lord came out of the land of Egypt;* and others are heavenly powers, for Scripture says, *The Lord of powers is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge.* Indeed Asterius, by title the sophist, had said the like in writing, having learned it from them, and before him Arius having learned it also, as has been said. But the Bishops, discerning in this too their simulation, and whereas it is written, *Deceit is in the heart of the impious that imagine evil*, were again compelled on their part to concentrate the sense of the Scriptures, and to re-say and re-write more distinctly still, what they had said before, namely, that the Son is "Consubstantial" with the Father; by way of signifying that the Son is from the Father, and not merely like, but is the same in likeness, and of showing that the Son's likeness and unalterable-

[1] Vid. ἀπαράλλακτον.

ness are different from such copy of the same as is ascribed to us, which we acquire from virtuous living and the observance of the commandments. ED. BEN. § 20.

29. For bodies which are like each other admit of separation and of becoming far off from each other, as are human sons relatively to their parents, (as it is written concerning Adam and Seth who was begotten of him, that he was like him after his own pattern;) but since the generation of the Son from the Father is not according to the nature of men, and He is not only like but also inseparable from the substance of the Father, and He and the Father are One, as He has said Himself, and the Word is ever in the Father and the Father in the Word, as is the radiance relatively to the light, (for this the very term indicates,) therefore the Council, as understanding this, suitably wrote "Consubstantial," [2] that they might both defeat the perverseness of the heretics, and show that the Word was other than created things. For, after thus writing, they at once added, "But they who say that the Son of God is from nothing, or created, or alterable, or a work, or from other substance, these the Holy Catholic Church anathematises." And in saying this, they showed clearly that "Of the substance," and "Consubstantial," do condemn those impious words, "created," and "work," and "brought into being," and "alterable," and "He was not before His generation." And he who holds these contradicts the Council; but he who does not hold with Arius, must needs hold and enter into the decisions of the Council, suitably regarding them to imply the relation of the radiance to the light, and from thence gaining an image of the sacred truth.

30. Therefore if these men, as their predecessors, make it an excuse that the terms are strange, let them consider the sense in which the Council so wrote, and anathematise

[2] Vid. *ὁμοούσιον*.

CHAP. V. what the Council anathematised; and then, if they can, let them find fault with those very terms. For I well know that, if they hold the sense of the Council, they will fully accept the terms in which it is conveyed; whereas if it be the sense which they wish to complain of, all must see that it is idle in them to discuss the wording, when they are but seeking for themselves excuses for a doctrine which is impious.

31. This then was the reason of these words; but if they still complain that such are not scriptural, I observe first, that they have to blame themselves, and no one else in this matter, for it was they who set the example, beginning their war against God with statements not in Scripture; and next, as any one who cares to inquire may easily ascertain, granting that the terms employed by the Council are not absolutely in Scripture, still, as I have said before, they contain the sense of Scripture.[3] Moreover, should they object that to speak of the substance of God is to teach that He is of a compound nature, (substance implying accidents,[4] and divinity, fatherhood and the like being therefore in the number of certain accidents by which His substance is clad or supplemented,[5]) I reply that the blasphemy, for such it is, is theirs, not ours. For we hold nothing of the kind. This would be to hold that God is material, and that His Son is after all not from His substance, but from a certain attribute or power which is attached to Him. But no; on the contrary, God is transcendently simple, and being such, it follows that in saying "God" and naming "Father," we name nothing besides Him, but we signify His substance or essence Itself. For though to comprehend what the substance of God is be impossible, yet let us only understand of God that He is a Being or Essence, and then, if Scripture indicates Him by means of these

[3] Vid. *Scripture.*
[4] Vid. *συμβεβηκός.*
[5] Vid. *περιβολή.*

names, we too, with the intention of indicating Him and none else, call Him God, and Father, and Lord.

32. When then He says, *I am He that is*,[6] and *I am the Lord God*, or when Scripture says, *God*, we understand nothing else by the words but an intimation of His incomprehensible substance Itself, and that He Is, who is spoken of. Therefore let no one be startled on hearing that the Son of God is from the substance of the Father; rather let him accept the explanation of the Bishops, who in more explicit but equivalent language have for *from God* written "Of the substance." For they considered it the same thing to say that the Word was *of God* and "of the substance of God," since the word "God," as I have already said, signifies nothing but the substance or essence of *Him who is*. If then the Word is not in such sense from God, as to be Son, genuine and natural, from the Father, but only as creatures are from Him, as being framed, and as *all things are from God*, then neither is He from the substance of the Father, nor again is the Son according to substance Son, but in consequence of virtue, as we who are called sons by grace. But if only He is *from* God, as a genuine Son, as He is, then let the Son, as is reasonable, be called from the substance of God. And the illustration of Light and its Radiance bears the same way. For the sacred writers have not said that the Word was related to God as fire kindled from the heat of the sun, which after a while goes out, for this is an external work and a creature of its author, but they all preach of Him as Radiance,[7] thereby to signify His being from the Divine substance, proper and indivisible, and to express His oneness with the Father. This also will secure His true unalterableness and immutability; for how can these be His, unless He be proper Offspring[8] of the Father's

[6] Vid. ὄν.
[7] Vid. ἀπαύγασμα.
[8] Vid. γέννημα.

CHAP. V. substance? For this too must be taken to confirm His identity with His own Father. And so again, if He be the Word, the Wisdom, the Father's Image, as well as Radiance, on these accounts He plainly must be consubstantial. For unless it be proved that He is not an offspring from God, but an instrument[9] different both in nature and in substance, surely the Council was happy in its wording as well as orthodox in its sense.

33. By this Offspring the Father made all things, and by Him, who is His radiance, diffusing His universal Providence, He exercises His love to men; not as if Light were a simple property lodged in the Son (as perhaps they will say) and only acted through Him, for it is Itself one with the Father, no channel foreign in substance to the Light and to its Fountain, no mere creation; no, this is the belief of Caiaphas and Samosatene, but the Light which is from the Father He possesses in fulness, and of Him others receive according to the measure of each, no intermediate existing between the Father and Him by whom all things have been brought into being. And in Him is the Father revealed and known, and with Him frames the world, and does all things, and is partaken by all things, for all things partake of the Son, as partaking of the Holy Ghost. And these prerogatives of the Son show beyond cavil that He is no creature, but a proper offspring from the Father, as radiance is from light.

CHAPTER VI.

34. THIS then is the intention with which the Fathers who met together at Nicæa made use of these terms; and next, having shown this, I will recur to what I said when I began. I said that at the Council, Euse-

[9] Vid. *ὄργανον*.

bius, after objecting to the definition passed by the Fathers assembled, acknowledged that it expressed the Church's faith, as it had come down to us by tradition. I then went on to say that certainly what those who went before us had delivered to us was the true doctrine, and of final authority, and to be followed. However, I thought it best, instead of simply appealing to the voice of Antiquity or of the agreement of Bishops, to explain and defend once more the phrases in which the Council had thought right to convey the Christian Truth. This I have now done; but I will not bring my letter to an end without giving these heretical teachers specimens of the language of writers of an earlier date, which are in accordance with that to which the Arians take exception. ED. BEN. § 24—25.

35. Know then first, O Arians, foes of Christ, that Theognostus,[1] a learned man, did not decline the phrase "Of the substance," for in the second book of his Hypotyposes, he writes thus of the Son:—

Testimony of Theognostus.

"The substance of the Son is not any addition from without, brought into the Divine Nature by a fresh creation, but It sprang from the Father's substance, as the radiance of light, as the vapour[2] of water; for neither the radiance, nor the vapour, is the water itself or the sun itself, nor is it alien, but is an effluence of the Father's substance, which, however, suffers no partition. For as the sun remains the same, and is not impaired by the rays poured forth by it, so neither does the Father's substance suffer change, though it has the Son as an Image of Itself."

Theognostus then, after first investigating in the way

[1] Vid. *Theognostus.* Origen. Periarch, i. 2, n. 5, ad. 9.
[2] Vid. Wisd. vii. 25, and so And Athan. Sent. Dion. 15.

CHAP. VI.

of an exercise,[3] proceeds to lay down his own sentiments in the foregoing words.

36. Next Dionysius, who was Bishop of Alexandria, upon his writing against Sabellius, and expounding at large the Saviour's economy according to the flesh, and thence proving against the Sabellians that not the Father but His Word was made flesh, as John has said, was suspected of saying that the Son was a creature and brought into being, and not consubstantial with the Father; on this he writes to his namesake Dionysius, Bishop of Rome, to explain that this was a slander upon him. And he assured him that he had not called the Son a creature, but on the contrary, that he did confess Him to be nothing else than consubstantial. And his words run thus:—

Testimony of Dionysius of Alexandria.

"And I have written in another letter a refutation of the false charge they bring against me, that I deny that Christ was consubstantial with God. For though I say that I have not found this term anywhere in Holy Scripture, yet my remarks which follow, and which they have not quoted, are not inconsistent with that belief. For I instanced a human production as being evidently homogeneous, and I observed that undeniably parents differed from their children only in not being simply the same, otherwise there could be neither parents nor children. And my letter, as I said before, owing to present

[3] *ἐν γυμνασίᾳ ἐξετάσας.* And so infr. 37 of Origen, *ζητων καὶ γυμνάζων* at a time when the points discussed had not been defined. Constantine, too, writing to Alexander and Arius, speaks of altercation, *φυσικῆς τινος γυμνασίας ἕνεκα.* Socr. i. 7. In somewhat a similar way, Athanasius speaks of Dionysius writing *κατ' οἰκονομίαν*, economically, or with reference to certain persons addressed or objects contemplated, de Sent. D. 6. and 26. In somewhat the same manner St. Thomas in his *Summa* first sets down the opinions he means to reject, and the reasons for them, and then his own.

circumstances I am unable to produce; or I would have sent you the very words I used, or rather a copy of the whole, which, if I have an opportunity, I will do still. But my memory is clear that I adduced various parallels of things kindred with each other; for instance, that a plant, grown from seed or from root, was other than that from which it sprang, yet was altogether one in nature with it: and that a stream flowing from a fountain, gained a new name, for that neither the fountain was called stream, nor the stream fountain, and both existed, and the stream was the water from the fountain." Ed. Ben. § 25—26.

37. And that the Word of God is not a work or creature, but an Offspring proper to the Father's substance and indivisible from it, as the great Council wrote, here you may see in the words of Dionysius, Bishop of Rome, who, while writing against the Sabellians, thus inveighs against those who dared to use their language:—

Testimony of Dionysius of Rome.

"Next, I have reason to mention those who separate and tear into portions and destroy that most sacred doctrine of the Church of God, the Divine Monarchy,[4] resolving it into certain three powers and divided subsistences and godheads three. I am told that some of your catechists and teachers of the Divine Word take the lead in this tenet, being in diametrical opposition, so to speak, to Sabellius's opinions; for he blasphemously says that the Son is the Father and the Father the Son, but they in some sort preach three Gods, as dividing the Holy Monad into three subsistences foreign to each other and utterly separate. For it must needs be that with the God of the Universe the Divine Word is united, and the Holy Ghost must repose and habitate in God; thus, in One as in a summit, I mean the God of the Universe, the Omni-

[4] Vid. Μοναρχία.

CHAP. VI. potent God, the Divine Triad[5] must of necessity be gathered up and brought together. For it is the doctrine of the presumptuous Marcion, to sever and divide the Divine Monarchy[6] into three origins,—a devil's teaching, not that of Christ's true disciples and lovers of the Saviour's lessons. For these know well that a Triad is preached by divine Scripture, but that neither Old Testament nor New preaches three Gods.

"Equally must we censure those who hold the Son to be a work, and consider that the Lord has come into being, as one of things which really came to be; whereas the divine oracles witness to a generation suitable to Him and becoming, but not to any fashioning or making. A blasphemy then is it, not ordinary, but even the highest, to say that the Lord is in any sort a handiwork. For if He became Son, once He was not; but He was always, if (that is) He be in the Father, as He says Himself, and if the Christ be Word and Wisdom and Power (which, as ye know, divine Scripture says,) and these attributes be powers of God. If then the Son came into being, once these attributes were not; consequently there was a season when God was without them; which is most extravagant. And why treat more on these points to you, men full of the Spirit, and well aware of the extravagances which come into view from saying that the Son is a work?

"Not attending, as I consider, to these, the originators of this opinion have entirely missed the truth, in understanding, contrary to the sense of divine and prophetic Scripture in the passage, the words, *The Lord hath created Me a beginning of His ways unto His works.* For *He created*, as ye know, has various senses; and in this place it must be taken to mean, 'He set Me over the works made by him,' that is, the works 'made by the Son Himself.'

[5] Vid. *τριάς*. [6] Or, one Origin.

And *He created* here must not be taken for *made*, for creating differs from making; *Is not He Thy Father that hath bought thee? hath He not made thee and created thee?* says Moses in his great Song in Deuteronomy. And one may say to them, is He a work, O reckless men, who is *the First-born of every creature, who is born from the womb before the morning star*, who said, as Wisdom, *Before all the hills He begets Me?* And in many passages of the divine oracles is the Son said to have been generated, but not to have come into being, passages which manifestly convict of misconception those men who presume to call His divine and ineffable generation a making.

"Neither then may we divide into three Godheads the wonderful and divine Monad; nor disparage with the name of 'creature' the dignity and exceeding majesty of the Lord; but we must believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Christ Jesus His Son, and in the Holy Ghost, and hold that to the God of the universe the Word is united. For *I*, says He, *and the Father are one;* and *I in the Father and the Father in Me.* For thus both the Divine Triad, and the holy preaching of the Monarchy will be secured."

38. And concerning the everlasting co-existence of the Word with the Father, and that He is not of another substance or subsistence, but proper to the Father's, as the Bishops in the Council said, hear again from the labour-loving Origen[7] also. For what he has written[8] as

[7] Montfaucon's text runs as follows:—*ἃ μὲν ὡς ζητῶν καὶ γυμνάζων ἔγραψε, ταῦτα μὴ ὡς αὐτοῦ φρονοῦντος ἐχέσθω τις· ἀλλὰ τῶν πρὸς ἔριν φιλονεικούντων ἐν τῷ ζητεῖν, ἀδεῶς ὁρίζων ἀποφαίνεται, τοῦτο τοῦ φιλοπόνου τὸ φρόνημά ἐστι.* For *ἀλλὰ* he reads *ἀλλ' ἃ*. "Certe legendum *ἀλλ' ἃ*, idque omnino exigit sensus." On the contrary I keep *ἀλλὰ*, remove the stop from *ἐχέσθω τις* to *ζητεῖν*, and for *ἀδεῶς* read *ἃ δὲ ὡς*, thus: *ταῦτα μὴ ὡς αὐτοῦ φρονοῦντος ἐχέσθω τις, ἀλλὰ τῶν πρὸς ἔριν φιλονεικούντων ἐν τῷ ζητεῖν· ἃ δὲ ὡς ὁρίζων ἀποφαίνεται τοῦτο τοῦ φιλοπόνου τὸ φρόνημά ἐστι.*

[8] Vid. also Serap. iv. 9.

CHAP. VI. if inquiring and exercising himself, that let no one take as expressive of his own sentiments, but of parties who are disputing in the course of investigation; but what he definitely pronounces, that is the sentiment of the labour-loving man. After his disputations then against the heretics, straightway he introduces his personal belief, thus :—

Testimony of Origen.

"If there be an Image of the Invisible God, it is an invisible Image; nay, I will be bold to add, that, as being the Likeness of the Father, never was it not. For when was that God, who, according to John, is called Light, (for *God is Light*,) without the Radiance of His proper glory, that a man should presume to assign the Son's beginning of existence, as if He were not before? But when was not in existence that Image of the Father's Ineffable and Indescribable and Unutterable subsistence, that Impress and Word, who alone knows the Father? for let him understand well who dares to say, 'Once the Son was not,' that he is saying, 'Once Wisdom was not,' and 'the Word was not,' and 'Life was not.'"

And again elsewhere he says:—

Another Testimony.

"But it is not without sin or peril if because of our weakness of understanding we deprive God, as far as in us lies, of the Only-begotten Word ever co-existing with Him, being the Wisdom in which He rejoiced; else He must be conceived as not always possessed of blessedness."

39. See, we are proving that this view has been transmitted from father to father; but ye, O modern Jews and disciples of Caiaphas, what fathers can ye assign to your

phrases? Not one of the understanding and wise; for all abhor you, save the devil alone; none but he is your father in such an apostasy, who both in the beginning scattered on your minds the seeds of this impiety, and now persuades you to slander the Ecumenical[9] Council, for committing to writing, not your doctrines, but that which *from the beginning those who were eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word have handed down to us.* For the faith which the Council has confessed in writing,[1] that is the faith of the Catholic Church; to vindicate this faith, the blessed Fathers so wrote, and thereby condemned the Arian heresy; and this is a chief reason why these men apply themselves to calumniate the Council. For it is not the terms which distress them, but because those terms proved them to be heretics, and daring beyond their fellows. Ed. Ben. § 27—28.

Chapter VII.

40. At Nicæa then, many years since, their heretical phrases were exposed and anathematised; this has led to their looking for new arguments, and it has issued in their borrowing from the Greeks a weapon for their need, namely, the term "Ingenerate,"[2] that by means of it, they may reckon among the things which were made that Word of God, by whom those very things came into being. However it would seem as if they really did not know what the Greeks meant by the term, for the Greek doctrine concerning it in fact tells pointedly against the use to which they put it. The Greeks, let it be observed, after deriving Mind from Good, and the universal Soul from Mind, have no difficulty in calling all three Ingenerate; Mind and Soul as well as Good,

[9] Vid. *Ecumenical.*
[1] Vid. *Definition.*
[2] Vid. ἀγέννητον.

CHAP. VII. from which Mind and Soul proceed.[3] If then these men must have recourse to heathen writers, let them be quite sure that the said writers make for them; but well I know, they never would have appealed to the Greeks in defence of their heresy, if they had any sanction of it in Scripture; and, as I on my part, have been stating the reason and the meaning with which the Council, and the Fathers earlier than it, defined and committed to writing "Of the substance" and "Consubstantial" agreeably to what Scripture[4] says, so I think I may fairly call upon these Arians to tell us now, if indeed they can, what has led them to this unscriptural term, "Ingenerate," what is the sense in which they consider it to belong to God, and why not to His Son and Word.

41. In truth, I am told[5] that the term has various senses: philosophers say that it means,[6] first, "what has not yet come, but may come, into being; next, what neither has come into being, nor can come; and thirdly, what exists without any birth or becoming, but is everlasting and indestructible." The first sense is nothing to the purpose, nor is the second; it is the third which they endeavour to make available to their purpose, arguing thus: that to be ingenerate is an attribute of God, that to be ingenerate is to be without birth or becoming, but that a Son is born into being. But who does not comprehend the craft of these foes of God? here is a manifest equivocation. It is possible to be ingenerate, that is from eternity, and yet to have an origin, that is, a Father; in other words, to have a birth and not a becoming, a deri-

[3] Vid. *Μοναρχία.*

[4] Vid. *Scripture.*

[5] Vid. *Athanasius.*

[6] Four senses of *ἀγέννητον* are enumerated, infr. Disc. ch. 10, p. 205. 1. What is not as yet, but is possible; 2. what neither has been, nor can be; 3. what exists, but has not come to be from any cause; 4. what is not made, but is ever. Only two senses are specified, infr. ch. 6, pp. 141, 142, and in these the question really lies: 1. what is, but without a cause; 2. uncreate.

vation and yet not a beginning. Even the Greeks, as I have said, hold an eternal derivation. Our Lord is ingenerate as being eternally one with God, generate as being His Son. He has a birth without a becoming. Ed. Ben. § 28—30.

42. However, the mania of these men is such that they say that a son is generate, and generate means made, and what is made comes "out of nothing;" and what has an origin "is not before its generation," and what is not eternal "once was not." Next, when detected in their sophisms they begin again, after this fashion, that to be ingenerate is to have no author of being, and an author is a maker, and therefore the Son is made, and is one of the creatures. Unthankful, and in truth deaf to the Scriptures, who do everything, and say everything, not to honour God, but to dishonour the Son, ignorant that he who dishonours the Son, dishonours the Father! If He be viewed as Offspring of the substance of the Father, He is of consequence with Him eternally. For this name of Offspring does not detract from the nature of the Word, nor does Ingenerate imply a contrast with the Son, but with the things which come into being through the Son; and as those who address an architect, and call him framer of house or city, do not under this designation include the son who is begotten from him, but on account of the art and science which he displays in his work, call him artificer, signifying thereby that he is not such as the things made by him, and while they know the nature of the builder, know also that he whom he begets is in nature other than his works; and in regard to his son call him father, but in regard to his works, creator and maker; in like manner he who says that God is ingenerate, invents a name for Him when compared with His works, signifying, not only that He is not brought into being but that He is maker of things which are so brought; yet is aware withal that the Word is other than the things that are

CHAP. VII. made, and alone is a proper Offspring of the Father, through whom all things came to be and consist.[7]

43. In like manner, when the Prophets spoke of God as All-powerful, they did not so name Him, as if the Word were included in that All; (for they knew that the Son was other than things made, and Sovereign over them Himself, by virtue of His likeness to the Father;) but because, while Sovereign over all things which through the Son He has made, God has given the authority of these things to the Son, and having given it, still is Himself as ever, the Lord of all things through Him. Again, when they called God, Lord of hosts, they said not this as if the Word was included in those hosts, but because, while He is Father of the Son, He is Lord of the hosts or powers which through the Son have come to be. And the Word too, as being in the Father, is Himself Lord of them all, and Sovereign over all; for all things, whatsoever the Father hath, are the Son's. This then being the force of such titles, in like manner let a man call God ingenerate, if it so please him; not however as if the Word were one of things generate or made, but because, as I said before, God not only is not made, but through His proper Word is He the maker of things which are made. For though the Father be specially called Maker, still the Word is the Father's Image and consubstantial with Him; and being His Image, He must be other than creatures altogether; for of whom He is the Image, to Him doth he belong and is like: so that he who calls the Father ingenerate and almighty, perceives in the Ingenerate and the Almighty, His Word and His Wisdom, which is the Son. But these wondrous men, and prone to impiety, hit upon the term Ingenerate, not as caring for God's honour, but from malevolence towards the Saviour; for if they had regard to His honour and worship, it rather

[7] Athanasius repeats this passage in his first Orat. i. infr. Disc. ch. 10, p. 208, &c.; also vid. Basil c. Eunom. i. 16.

had been right and good to acknowledge and to call Him Father, than to give Him this name; for in calling Him ingenerate, they are, as I said before, calling Him strictly from His relation to things which came into being, and simply as a Maker, that so they may imply even the Word to be a work after their own desire; but he who calls God Father, thereby in Him signifies His Son also, and will not fail to understand that, whereas there is a Son, through this Son all things that came into existence were created. Ed. Ben. § 30—31.

44. I repeat, it will be much more accurate to denote God from the Son, and to call Him Father, than to name Him and call Him Ingenerate from His works merely; for the latter term refers to the works that have been brought into being at the will of God through the Word, but the name of Father betokens the proper Offspring from His substance. And by how much the Word surpasses things made or generate, by so much and more also doth calling God Father surpass the calling Him Ingenerate; for the latter is unscriptural and suspicious, as it has various senses; but the former is simple and scriptural, and more accurate, and alone implies the Son. And "Ingenerate" is a word of the Greeks who know not the Son: but "Father" has been acknowledged and vouchsafed to us by our Lord; for He, Himself, knowing whose Son He was, said, *I in the Father and the Father in Me;* and, *He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father;* and, *I and the Father are one;* but nowhere is He found to call the Father Ingenerate. Moreover, when He teaches us to pray, He says not, "When ye pray, say, O God Ingenerate," but rather *When ye pray say, Our Father, who art in heaven.*

45. Moreover, it was His Will, that the compendium of our faith should look the same way. For He has bid us be baptised, not into the name of the Ingenerate and generate, not into the name of Uncreate and creature, but into the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; for with such an

CHAP. VII. initiation we also are made sons verily,[8] and, while using the name of the Father, we acknowledge from that name, the Word in the Father. But if He wills that we should call His own Father our Father, we must not on that account measure ourselves with the Son according to nature, for it is because of the Son that the Father is so called by us; for since the Word bore our body and in us came to be, therefore, by reason of the Word in us, is God called our Father. For the Spirit of the Word in us, addresses through us His own Father as ours, which is the Apostle's meaning when he says, *God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.*

46. So much on the term "Ingenerate," which admits indeed of a pious use, but, in the hands of Christ's foes, has but covered them with shame, as did their words and deeds at the beginning. How the Council, then assembled at Nicæa, met them, with what prudence and with what fidelity to Holy Scripture and the Fathers, I have related and explained to the best of my powers; but I cannot hope that those restless spirits will give up their opposition now any more than then. They will doubtless run about in search of other pretences, and of others again after those. When, in the Prophet's words, will *the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots?* Thou, however, Beloved, on receiving this, read it by thyself; and, if thou approvest of it, read it also to the brethren, who are with thee, that they too, on hearing it, may respond to the Council's zeal for the truth and for doctrinal exactness, and may reprobate the heresy and the controversial devices of the Arian faction; because to God, even the Father, is due the glory, honour, and worship, with His co-unoriginate Son and Word, together with the All-holy and life-giving Spirit, now and unto endless ages of ages. Amen.

[8] Vid. κύριος and γεννητόν.

Appendix.

LETTER OF EUSEBIUS OF CÆSAREA TO THE PEOPLE OF HIS DIOCESE.

47. What was transacted concerning the Faith of the Church at the Great Council assembled at Nicæa, you have probably learned, Beloved, from other quarters, rumour being wont to precede the accurate account of what is doing. But lest in such reports the circumstances of the case should have been misrepresented to you, we have thought it necessary to transmit to you, first, the formula of faith presented by ourselves, and then, the second, which the Fathers put forth with some additions to our words. Our own formula then, which was read in the presence of our most pious[9] Emperor, and declared to be good and unexceptionable, ran thus :— Ed. Ben. § 31—1.

48. "As we have received from the Bishops who preceded us, and in our first catechisings, and when we received Holy Baptism, and as we have learned from the divine Scriptures, and as we believed and taught when in the order of presbyters, and in the Episcopate itself, so believing also at the time present, we report to you our faith, and it is this :—

Creed of Eusebius.

"We believe in One God, the Father Almighty, the Maker of all things visible and invisible.

"And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God from God, Light from Light, Life from Life, Son Only-begotten, first-born of every creature, before all the ages begotten from the Father, through whom also all things were made; who for our salvation was made flesh, and lived among men, and suffered and rose again the third day, and ascended to the Father, and will come again in glory to judge quick and dead.

[9] Vid. *Imperial titles.*

APPEND. "And we believe also in one Holy Ghost; believing each of These to be and to exist, the Father truly Father, and the Son truly Son, and the Holy Ghost truly Holy Ghost; as also our Lord, sending forth His disciples for the preaching, said, *Go, teach all the nations, baptising them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* Concerning whom we confidently affirm that so we hold and so we think, and so we have held aforetime, and that we maintain this faith unto the death, anathematising every godless heresy. That this we have ever thought from our heart and soul, from the time we recollect ourselves, and now think and say in truth, before God Almighty and our Lord Jesus Christ do we bear witness, being able by proofs to show and to convince you that also in times past such was our belief and such our preaching."

49. On this faith being publicly put forth by us, no room for contradiction appeared to any one; but our most pious Emperor himself before any one else, testified that it comprised most orthodox statements. He confessed moreover, that such were his own sentiments, and he exhorted all present to agree to it, and to subscribe its articles and to assent to the same, with the insertion of the single word, "Consubstantial," which moreover he interpreted as not in the sense of the affections of bodies, nor as if the Son subsisted from the Father in the way of division or any severance; for that the immaterial, and intellectual, and incorporeal Nature could not be the subject of any corporeal affection, but that it became us to conceive of such things in a divine and ineffable manner. And such were the theological remarks of our most wise and most religious Emperor; on which the Bishops, with a view to the addition of Consubstantial, drew up the following formula:—

Nicene Creed.

"We believe in One God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible :— ED. BEN. § 3—5.

"And in One Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, Only-begotten, that is, from the Substance of the Father; God from God, Light from Light, Very God from Very God, begotten not made, consubstantial with the Father, by whom all things were made, both things in heaven and things in earth; who for us men and for our salvation came down and was made flesh, was made man, suffered, and rose again the third day, ascended into heaven, and cometh to judge quick and dead.

"And in the Holy Ghost.

"But those who say, 'Once He was not,' and 'Before His generation He was not,' and 'He came into being from nothing,' or those who pretend that the Son of God is 'Of other subsistence or substance,' or 'created,' or 'alterable,' or 'mutable,' the Catholic Church anathematises."

50. On their dictating this formula, we did not let it pass without inquiry in what sense they introduced "Of the substance of the Father," and "consubstantial with the Father." Accordingly questions and explanations took place, and the meaning of the words underwent the scrutiny of reason. And they professed, that the phrase "Of the substance" was indicative of the Son's being indeed from the Father, yet without being as if a part of Him. And with this understanding we thought good to assent to the sense of such religious doctrine, teaching, as it did, that the Son was from the Father, not however a part of His substance. On this account we assented to this sense ourselves, without declining even the term "Consubstantial," peace being the object which we set before us, and maintenance of the orthodox view.

APPEND. 51. In the same way we also admitted "Begotten, not made;" since the Council alleged that "made" was an appellative common to the other creatures which came to be through the Son, to whom the Son had no likeness. Therefore, it was said, He was not a work resembling the things which through Him came to be, but was of a substance which is above the level of any work, and which the Divine oracles teach to have been generated from the Father, the mode of generation being inscrutable and incomprehensible to every created nature.

52. And so too on examination there are grounds for saying, that the Son is "consubstantial" with the Father; not in the way of bodies, nor like mortal beings, for He is not consubstantial by division of substance, or by severance, no nor by any affection, or changing, or alteration of the Father's substance and attributes[1] (since from all such the ingenerate nature of the Father is alien), but because "consubstantial with the Father" suggests that the Son of God bears no resemblance to the creatures which have been made, but that He is in every way after the pattern of His Father alone who begat Him, and that He is not of any other subsistence and substance, but from the Father. To which term also, thus interpreted, it appeared well to assent; since we were aware that even among the ancients, some learned and illustrious bishops and writers have used the term "consubstantial" in their theological teaching concerning the Father and Son.[2]

53. So much then be said concerning the Faith which has been published; to which all of us assented, not without inquiry, but according to the specified senses, mentioned in the presence of the most religious Emperor himself, and justified by the forementioned considerations. And as to the

[1] *δύναμεως*.

[2] Athanasius, in like manner, speaks, ad Afr. § 6, of "testimony of ancient Bishops about 130 years since," and infr., p. 80. Vid. *ὁμοούσιον*.

anathematism published by the Fathers at the end of the Faith, it did not trouble us, because it forbade to use words not in Scripture, from which almost all the confusion and disorder of the Church has come. Since then no divinely inspired Scripture has used the phrases, "Out of nothing," and "Once He was not," and the rest which follow, there appeared no ground for using or teaching them; to which also we assented as a good decision, since it had not been our custom hitherto to use these terms. Ed. Len. § 6—11.

54. Moreover to anathematise "Before His generation He was not," did not seem preposterous, in that it is confessed by all, that the Son of God was before the generation according to the flesh. Nay, our most religious Emperor did at the time prove in a speech, that even according to His divine generation which is before all ages, He was in being, since even before He was generated in act, He was in virtue[3] with the Father ingenerately, the Father being always Father, as King always, and Saviour always, being all things in virtue, and having all things in the same respects and in the same way.

55. This we have been forced to transmit to you, Beloved, as making clear to you the deliberateness of our inquiry and assent, and how reasonably we resisted even to the last minute as long as we were offended at statements which differed from our own, but received without contention what no longer troubled us, as soon as, on a candid examination of the sense of the words, they appeared to us to coincide with what we ourselves had professed in the Faith which we had already published.

[3] Socrates, who advocates the orthodoxy of Eusebius, omits this heterodox sentence. Hist. 1—8. Bull, Defens. F. N. iii. 9, n. 3, supposes it an interpolation. For its refutation, vid. infr. Orat. i. ch. 8 fin. p. 189. For Eusebius's opinions, vid. Append. *Eusebius* and *Semiarianism*.

EPISTLE OF ATHANASIUS,

ARCHBISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA,

ON THE COUNCILS HELD AT ARIMINUM IN ITALY AND AT SELEUCIA IN ISAURIA.

PREFATORY NOTICE.

THE following Epistle consists of three parts or six chapters, of which the first two chapters alone answer to the received title "Of the Synods of Ariminum and Seleucia." So much as this was contemporaneous history, from information gained with remarkable despatch, though coming short of the date of the catastrophe at Ariminum, when to "the astonishment" of the great mass of its members, the Council "found itself Arian." This was in the year 359. In 361 Athanasius seems to have added to his work several later documents. Vid. Ed. Ben. § 30, 31, and their preceding *Monitum.*

The place is unknown from which he wrote. In 359 he seems to have been in hiding; Tillemont, and Gibbon after him, suggest in consequence of the wording of his opening sentences, that he was present *incognito* at Seleucia.

The Arian party had long wished to accomplish the meeting of a general Council which might supersede that of Nicæa. They had effected one great Eastern Council in 341 at Antioch, and another at Sirmium in 351. And now in 359 they aimed at a gathering of both East and West. It was originally convoked for Nicæa, the site of that first and great Council which was to be put aside, but the party of Basil the Semi-arian, not approving of this choice, Nicomedia was substituted. The Bishops had set out when an earthquake threw the city into ruins. Nicæa was then substituted, this time at Basil's wish, Soz. iv. 16, but it was considered too near the seat of the

earthquake to be safe. Then the Eusebian or Acacian influence prevailed, and the Council was divided into two, one portion to meet at Ariminum, the other at Seleucia; but at first Ancyra, Basil's see, was to have been one of them (where a celebrated Council of Semi-arians actually was sitting at the time), Hil. de Syn. 8, but this was changed for Seleucia. A delegacy of Bishops from each Province had been summoned to Nicomedia; but to Nicæa, according to Sozomen, all Bishops whatever, whose health admitted of the journey; Hilary, however, says only one or two from each province of Gaul were summoned to Ariminum, he himself being at Seleucia by compulsion of the local magistrate, as an exile there for the faith, Sulp. ii. 57.

As to this bipartite Council, it was the concluding act of a long series of heretical attempts to commit the Church through her Synods to Arian doctrine, attempts which Athanasius has here, in his chapters iii. and iv., recorded and illustrated, after his manner, viz., by the documentary evidence of the creeds which were successively passed through those Synods, and of the State papers which arose out of them.

Chapters v. and vi., with which the Epistle ends, recur to the defence of the Homoüsion, which has been the subject of the foregoing Epistle. The latter of the two chapters is specially directed towards the removal of the difficulties which the Semi-arians felt in accepting the Nicene definition, a party to whom Athanasius is as gentle as he is fierce with the Arians.

It may be added, as has indeed appeared in what has gone before, that the large Arian party was divided into three:— (1) the pure Arians or Anomœans, who would not even allow that the Son was like the Father; (2) the chief object of their attack, the Homœüsians or Semi-arians, who maintained that the Son was like the Father even in Substance; (3) and the Court party, Eusebians or Acacians, who would not go farther than to say vaguely that our Lord was like the Father, and wished to keep to Scripture terms.

EPISTLE OF ATHANASIUS,

&c.

Chapter I.

1. Perhaps news has reached even yourselves concerning the Council, which is at this time the subject of general conversation; for letters both from the Emperor and the Prefects[1] were circulated far and wide for its convocation. However, you take such interest in the events which have occurred, that I am led to give you an account of what I have seen myself or have ascertained, which may save you from the suspense attendant on the reports of others; and this the more, because there are parties who are in the practice of misrepresenting what is going on.

2. At Nicæa then which had been fixed upon, the Council did not meet, but a second edict was issued, convening the Western Bishops at Ariminum in Italy, and the Eastern at Seleucia the Rocky, as it is called, in Isauria. The professed reason given out for such a meeting was to treat of the faith touching our Lord Jesus

[1] There were at this time four Prætorian Prefects, who divided between them the administration of the Empire. They had been lately made civil officers, Constantine having suppressed the celebrated troops which they had commanded. At Ariminum one of them, Taurus, was present, and was the instrument of the Emperor in overawing the Council.

CHAP. I. Christ; and those who alleged it, were Ursacius and Valens, and one Germinius, from Pannonia; and from Syria, Acacius, Eudoxius, and Patrophilus of Scythopolis.[2] These men who had always been of the Arian party, and *understood neither how they believed nor whereof they affirmed*, and were silently deceiving first one and then another, and scattering the second sowing of their heresy, persuaded some persons of consequence, and the Emperor Constantius among them, being a heretic, on some pretence about the Faith, to call a Council; under the idea that they should be able to put into the shade the Nicene Council, and prevail upon all to turn round, to the establishment of impiety everywhere instead of the Truth.

3. Now here I marvel first, and consider that I shall carry every thinking man whomsoever with me, that, whereas a Catholic Council had been fixed, and all were looking forward to it, it was all of a sudden divided in two, so that one part met here, and the other there. However, this would seem providential, in order, in each Council, to exhibit the faith without guile or corruption of the one party, and to expose the dishonesty and duplicity of the other. Next, this too was on the mind of myself and my true brethren here, and made us anxious, the impropriety in itself of this great gathering which we saw in progress; for what then pressed so much, that the whole world was to be thrown into confusion,[3] and those who at the time bore the profession of clerks, should run about far and near, seeking forsooth how best to learn to believe in our Lord Jesus

[2] Vid. App. *Arian leaders.*

[3] The heathen Ammianus speaks of "the troops of Bishops hurrying to and fro at the public expense," and "the Synods, in their efforts to bring over the whole religion to their side, being the ruin of the posting establishments." Hist. xxi. 16. "The spectacle proceeds to that pitch of indecency," says Eusebius, "that at length in the very midst of the theatres of the unbelievers the solemn matters of divine teaching were subjected to the basest mockery." Vit. Const. ii. 61.

Christ? Certainly, if they were believers already, they would not be seeking, as though they were not. ED. BEN. § 1–3.

And to the catechumens, this was no small scandal; but to the heathen, it was something more than common, and even furnished broad merriment, that Christians, as if waking out of sleep at this time of day, should be making out how they were to believe concerning Christ; while their professed clerks, though claiming deference from their flocks as teachers, were unbelievers on their own showing, since they were seeking what they had not. And the party of Ursacius, who were at the bottom of all this, did not understand what wrath they were storing up against themselves, as our Lord says by the sacred writers, *Woe unto them, through whom My Name is blasphemed among the Gentiles;* and by His own mouth in the Gospels, *Whoso shall offend one of these little ones, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea, than*, as Luke adds, *that he should offend one of these little ones.*

4. What defect in religious teaching was there in the Catholic Church, that they should be searching after faith now, and should prefix this year's Consulate to the profession they make of it? Yet Ursacius, and Valens, and Germinius, and their friends have done, what never took place, never yet was heard of, among Christians. After putting into writing what it pleased themselves to believe, they prefix to it the Consulate, and the month and the day of the current year;[4] thereby to show all thinking men that

[4] "Faith is made a thing of dates rather than of Gospels, while it is marked off by years, and is not measured by the confession of baptism." Hil. ad Const. ii. 4. "We determine yearly and monthly creeds concerning God, we determine them and then repent of them; we repent and then defend them; we anathematise after defending; we condemn our own doings in the doings of others, or those of others in our own, and gnawing each other, we are well-nigh devoured one of another." Ibid. 5.

CHAP. I. their faith dates, not from of old, but now, from the reign of Constantius; for whatever they write has a view to their own heresy. Moreover, though pretending to write about the Lord, they nominate another sovereign for themselves, Constantius, who has provided for them this supremacy of impiety; and they who deny that the Son is everlasting, have called him Eternal Emperor instead; such foes of Christ are they in behalf of their impiety.

5. But perhaps the dates in the holy Prophets form their excuse for naming the Consulate; so bold a pretence, however, will serve but to publish more fully their ignorance of the subject. For the prophecies of the sacred writers do indeed specify their times; (for instance, Esaias and Osee lived in the days of Ozias, Joatham, Achaz, and Ezekias; Jeremias, in the days of Josias; Ezekiel and Daniel prophesied under Cyrus and Darius; and others in other times;) yet they were not laying the foundations of divine religion; that was before their date, and was always, for before the foundation of the world had God prepared it for us in Christ. Nor were they signifying the respective dates of their own faith; for they had been believers before these dates, which did but belong to their own preaching. And this preaching chiefly related to the Saviour's coming, and secondarily to what was to happen to Israel and the nations; but our modern sages, not in historical narration, nor in prediction of the future, but, after writing, "The Catholic Faith was published," immediately add the Consulate and the month and the date; that, as the sacred writers were wont to set down the dates of their histories, and of their own ministries, so these may mark the date of their own faith. Nay, it would be well if they had written about "their own," (for it does date from to-day) and had not taken in hand "the Catholic;" for they did not write, "Thus we believe," but "the Catholic Faith was published."

6. The boldness then of their purpose shows how little they understand the subject; while the originality of their phrase befits their heresy. For thus they show in set words when it was that their own faith began, and from that same time present they would have it proclaimed. And, as according to the Evangelist Luke, there *was made a decree* concerning the registration, and this decree before was not, but began from those days in which it was made by its framer, they also in like manner, by writing, "The Faith is now published," showed that the views of their heresy are young, and did not exist before. But when they add "of the Catholic Faith," they have fallen before they know it into the extravagance of the Phrygians, and say together with them, "To us first was revealed," and "from us dates the Faith of Christians." And as those sectaries inscribe it with the names of Maximilla and Montanus, so do these with "Constantius, Sovereign," instead of Christ. If, however, as they would have it, the faith dates from the present Consulate, what must the Fathers do, and the blessed Martyrs? nay, what will they themselves do with their own catechumens, who went to rest before this Consulate? how will they wake their pupils up, that they may obliterate that old teaching which they then thought so sufficient, and may sow instead the discoveries which they have now put into writing? so ignorant are they on the subject; with no knowledge but that of framing evasions, and those unbecoming and unplausible, and carrying with them their own refutation! ED. BEN. § 3—5.

7. As to the Nicene Council, it was no casual meeting, but convened upon a pressing necessity, and for a reasonable object. The Syrians, Cilicians, and Mesopotamians, were out of order in celebrating the Feast, and were wont to keep Easter with the Jews;[5] on the other hand, the

[5] This seems to have been an innovation in these countries of about fifty years old, or from about the year 276. It is remarkable.

CHAP. I. Arian heresy had risen up against the Catholic Church, and found supporters in the party of Eusebius, who were both zealous for the heresy, and conducted the attack upon religious people. This gave occasion for an Ecumenical Council, that the feast might be everywhere celebrated on one day, and that the heresy which was springing up might be anathematised. It took place then; and the Syrians submitted, and the Fathers pronounced the Arian heresy to be a forerunner of Antichrist,[6] and drew up a suitable formula against it. And yet, in this definition, for all their authority of numbers, they ventured on nothing like the acts of these three or four men.[7] Without prefixing Consulate, month, and day, they wrote concerning the Easter, "It seemed good as follows," for it did then seem good that there should be a general compliance; but about the faith they wrote not, "It seemed good," but, "Thus believes the Catholic Church;" and thereupon they confessed what was the ground of their faith, in order to show that their own belief was not novel, but Apostolical; and that what they wrote down was no discovery of theirs, but is the same as was taught by the Apostles.

8. Such was the Council of Nicæa; but the Councils which they have set in motion, what colourable pretext have these? If any new heresy has risen since the Arian, let them tell us the statements which it has invented and who are its inventors? and while they draw up a formula of their own, let them at the same time anathematise the

that the Quartodeciman custom had come to an end in Proconsular Asia, where it had existed from St. John's time, before it began in Syria. Tillemont refers the change to Anatolius of Laodicea; I have before now thought it might be traced to the influence of Zenobia and Paul of Samosata; vid. Arians, ch. i. § 1.

[6] Vid. *ntichrist.*

[7] ὀλίγοι τινές, says Pope Julius in 342 ap. Athan. Apol. 34. ἔγραψάν τινες περὶ πίστεως, says Athan. in 356 ad Ep. Æg. 5. Infr. pp. 70—73, supr. n. 2, p. 64, he mentions by name six, Acacius, &c.

heresies antecedent to this their Council, among which is the Arian, as the Nicene Fathers did, that it may be made appear that they too have some cogent reason for saying what is on any view a novelty. But if no such event has happened, and they cannot produce such, but rather they themselves are uttering heresies, as holding that very impiety of Arius, and are held up day after day, and day by day shift their ground, what need is there of Councils, when the Nicene is sufficient, as against the Arian heresy, so against the rest, which it has condemned one and all already by setting forth the sound faith? For even the notorius Aetius, who was surnamed godless, vaunts not of the discovering of any mania of his own, but under stress of weather has been wrecked upon bare Arianism, himself and the persons whom he has beguiled. Vainly then do they run about with the pretext that they have demanded Councils for the faith's-sake, for divine Scripture is sufficient above all things; but if a Council be needed on the point, there are the authoritative acts of the Nicene Fathers, for they did not do their work carelessly, but stated the doctrine so exactly, that persons reading their words honestly, cannot but find their memory refreshed in respect to the pious doctrine concerning Christ announced in divine Scripture. ED. BEN. § 5—6.

9. Having therefore no show of reason on their side, but being in difficulty whichever way they turn, in spite of their evasions, they have nothing left but to say: "Forasmuch as we contradict our predecessors, and transgress the traditions of the Fathers, therefore we have thought good that a Council should meet; but again, whereas we fear lest, should it meet at one place, our pains will be all thrown away, therefore we have thought good that it be divided into two; that so, on our putting forth our own formula to these separate portions, we may overreach with more effect, with the threat of Constantius our

CHAP. II.

patron in this impiety, and may abrogate the acts of Nicæa, under pretence of introducing a more simple faith." If they have not put this into words, yet this is the meaning of their deeds and of their disturbances. Certainly many and frequent as have been their speeches and writings in various Councils, never yet have they made mention of the Arian heresy as unchristian; but, if anyone present happened to accuse the existing heresies, they always took up the defence of the Arian, which the Nicene Council had anathematised; nay, rather they cordially welcomed its professors. This then is in itself a strong argument, that the aim of the present Councils has been not truth, but the annulling of the acts of Nicæa; but the proceedings of these men and their friends in the two Councils, make it equally clear that this was the case:—It is necessary then to relate everything as it occurred, as I proceed to do.

CHAPTER II.

10. WHEN all, as many as were named in the Emperor's letters, were in expectation of one place of meeting, and to form one Council, they were divided into two; and, while some went off to Seleucia called the Rocky, the others met at Ariminum, to the number of four hundred bishops and more, and among them Germinius, Auxentius, Valens, Ursacius, Demophilus, and Caius.[8] And, while the whole assembly was discussing the matter from the divine Scriptures, these men produced a paper, and, reading the Consulate, they demanded that the whole Council should give this the precedence of anything else, and put no tests upon the heretics beyond it, nor inquire into its meaning, but take this confession as sufficient; and it ran as follows:[9]—

[8] Vid. *Arian leaders.*

[9] The Creed which follows had

Eighth Confession, at Sirmium (third Sirmian, vid. infr. p. 114). Ed. Ben. § 7—8.

11. "The Catholic Faith was published in the presence of our Sovereign the most religious and gloriously victorious Emperor, Constantius, Augustus, the eternal and majestic, in the Consulate of the most illustrious Flavians, Eusebius and Hypatius, in Sirmium on the 11th of the Calends of June.[1]

"We believe in one Only and True God, the Father Almighty, Creator and Framer of all things:

"And in one Only-begotten Son of God, who before all ages, and before every origin, and before all conceivable time, and before all comprehensible substance, was begotten impassibly from God; through whom the ages were disposed and all things were made; and begotten as the Only-begotten, as only from the Only Father, as God from God, like to the Father who begat Him, according to the Scriptures; whose generation no one knoweth save the Father alone who begat Him. We know that He, the Only-begotten Son of God, at the Father's bidding came from the heavens for the abolition of sin, and was born of the Virgin Mary, and conversed with the disciples, and fulfilled all the economy according to the Father's will, and was crucified, and died and descended into the parts beneath the earth, and directed the economy of things there, whom the gate-keepers of hell saw and shuddered; and that He rose from the dead the third day, and conversed with the disciples, and fulfilled the economy, and, when the forty days were full, ascended into the heavens,

been prepared at Sirminm shortly before, and is the third, or, as some think, the fourth, drawn np at Sirmium. It was the composition of Mark of Arethusa, yet it was written in Latin; and though Mark was a Semi-arian, it distinctly abandons the word substance. But this point of history is involved in much obscurity. As it stands, it is a patchwork of two views It will be observed, that it is the Creed on which Athanasius has been animadverting above, p. 65.

[1] May 22, 359, Whitsun Eve.

CHAP. II.

and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, and will come in the last day of the resurrection in the glory of the Father, to render to every one according to his works.

"And in the Holy Ghost, whom the Only-begotten of God Himself, Jesus Christ, had promised to send to the race of men, the Paraclete, as it is written, 'I go to the Father, and I will ask the Father, and He shall send unto you another Paraclete, even the Spirit of Truth. He shall take of Mine and shall teach and bring to your remembrance all things.'

"But whereas the term 'substance,' has been adopted by the Fathers in simplicity, and gives offence as unintelligible to the people, and not contained in the Scriptures, it has seemed good to remove it, and that it be never in any case used of God again, because the divine Scriptures nowhere use it of Father and Son. But we say that the Son is like the Father in all things, as all the Holy Scriptures say and teach."[2]

12. When this had been read, the dishonesty of its framers was soon apparent. For on the Bishops proposing that the Arian heresy should be anathematised together with the other heresies, and all assenting, Ursacius and Valens and their friends refused, and at length were condemned, on the ground that their confession had been written, not in sincerity, but for the annulling of the Acts of Nicæa, and the introduction instead of their miserable heresy. Marvelling then at the deceitfulness of their language and their unprincipled intentions, the Bishops said: "Not as if in need of faith have we come hither; for we have within us the faith, and that in soundness; but that we may put to shame those who gainsay the truth and venture upon novelties. If then ye have drawn up this formula, as if now beginning to believe, ye are not so much as clerks, but need to start with your catechism; but if

[2] Vid. infr. Creeds vii. and ix., pp. 114—116.

you meet us here with the same religious sentiments with which we have come hither, let there be a unanimity, of one and all, and let us anathematise the heresies, and preserve the teaching of the Fathers. Thus pleas for new Councils will not longer circulate about, the Bishops at Nicæa having anticipated them once for all, and done all that was needful for the Catholic Church." However, even then, in spite of an unanimous agreement of the Bishops a second time, still the above-mentioned refused. So at length the whole assembly, condemning them as ignorant and deceitful men, or rather as heretics, gave their suffrages in behalf of the Nicene Council, and gave judgment all of them that it was enough; but as to the forenamed Ursacius and Valens, Germinius, Auxentius, Caius, and Demophilus, they pronounced them to be heretics, deposed them as not really Christians, but Arians, and wrote against them in Latin what has been translated in its substance into Greek, thus:— Ed. Ben. § 8—10.

13. *Copy of an Epistle from the Council to Constantius, Augustus:*—[3]

"We believe it has been ordered by God's command, upon the mandate[4] of your religiousness, that we, the Bishops of the Western Provinces, came from all parts to Ariminum, for the manifestation of the Faith to all Catholic Churches and the detection of the heretics. For upon a general discussion, in which we who are orthodox all took part, it was our decision to adhere to that faith which

[3] The same version of the Letter which follows is found in Socr. ii. 39. Soz. iv. 10. Theod. Hist. ii. 19. Niceph. i. 40. On comparison with the Latin original, which is preserved by Hilary, (Fragm. viii.) it appears to be so very freely executed, that it has been thought better here to translate it from the text of Hilary.

[4] Ex præcepto. Præceptum becomes a technical word afterwards for a royal deed, charter, or ediet; and it has somewhat of that meaning even here.

CHAP. II. has come down to us from antiquity, and which we hold, as we have ever held, from Prophets, Gospels, and Apostles, from God Himself and our Lord Jesus Christ, the upholder of your dominion, and the author of your welfare. For we deemed it to be a sin to mutilate any work of the saints, and in particular of those who in the framing of the Nicene formulary, held session together with Constantine of glorious memory, the father of your religiousness. Which formulary was put abroad and gained entrance into the minds of the Christian people, and, as at that time drawn up against Arianism, is found to be of such force that heresies of all kinds are overthrown by it; from which, if aught were subtracted, an opening is made to the poison of the heretics.

"Therefore it was that Ursacius and Valens formerly came into suspicion of the said Arian heresy, and were suspended from communion, and had to ask pardon, as their letters show, which they obtained from the Council of Milan, in the presence of the legates of the Roman Church. And since Constantine was at the Nicene Council, when the formulary in question was drawn up with great care, and after being baptised into the profession of it, departed to God's rest, we think it a crime to mutilate aught in it, and in anything to detract from so many Saints and Confessors, and Successors of Martyrs, who took part in framing it; considering that they preserved all the doctrine of the Catholics who were before them according to the Scriptures, and that they remained with us unto these times in which your religiousness has received the charge of ruling the world from God the Father through our God and Lord Jesus Christ. As for these men, they were attempting to pull up what had been reasonably laid down. For, whereas the letters of your religiousness commanded us to treat of the faith, there was proposed to us by the aforenamed troublers of the

Churches, Germinius and his associates Auxentius[5] and Caius, something simply novel for our consideration, which contained many particulars of perverse doctrine. And next, when they became aware that what they proposed publicly in the Council was unacceptable to the Fathers, they determined to draw up another determined statement. Indeed it is notorious that they have often changed these formularies in a short time; accordingly, lest the Churches should have a recurrence of these disturbances, we held to our resolve to retain decisions which were both ancient and reasonable. For the information therefore of your clemency, we have instructed our legates to acquaint you with the judgment of the Council by our letter, to whom we have given this sole direction, not to execute their office otherwise than for the absolute stability and permanence of the ancient decrees; in order that your wisdom might also know, that peace would not be accomplished by the removal of those decrees, as the aforesaid Valens and Ursacius, Germinius and Caius, promised. On the contrary, troubles have in consequence been excited in all regions and in the Roman Church. Ed. Ben. § 10.

"On this account we ask your clemency to receive and hear all our legates with favourable ears and a serene countenance, and not to suffer aught to be abrogated to the dishonour of the ancients; so that all things may continue which we have received from our forefathers, who, as we are sure, were prudent men, and acted not without the

[5] Auxentius, omitted in Hilary's copy, has been inserted here, and in the decree which follows, from the Greek, since Athanasius has thus given his sanction to the fact of that Arian Bishop being condemned at Ariminum. Yet Auxentius appeals to Ariminum triumphantly. Hil. contr. Aux. fin. Socrates, Hist. ii. 37, says, that Demophilus also was deposed, but he was an Eastern Bishop, if he be Demophilus of Berea, vid. Coustant. on Hil. Fragm. vii., p. 1342. Yet he is mentioned also by Athanasius as present, supr. p. 70. A few words are wanting in the Latin in the commencement of one of the sentences which follow.

CHAP. II. Holy Spirit of God; because by these novelties not only are faithful populations unsettled, but infidels also are deterred from believing. We pray also that you would give orders that so many Bishops, who are detained at Ariminum, among whom are numbers who are broken with old age and poverty, may return to their own country, lest the people of their Churches suffer, being deprived of their Bishops. This, however, we ask again and again, that nothing be innovated, nothing withdrawn; but that all remain incorrupt which has continued through the times of the father of your sacred piety and your own religious days; and that your holy prudence will not permit us to be harassed, and torn from our sees; but that we may without distraction ever give ourselves to the prayers which we do always offer for your personal welfare and for your reign, and for peace, which may the Divinity bestow on you, according to your merits, profound and perpetual! But our legates will bring the subscriptions and names of the Bishops and their titles, as another letter informs your holy and religious prudence."

14. And the Decree of the Council[6] ran thus:—

"As far as it was fitting, dearest brethren, the Catholic Council has had patience, and has so often displayed the Church's forbearance towards Ursacius and Valens, Germinius, Caius, and Auxentius; who by so often changing what they had believed, have troubled all the Churches, and still are endeavouring to introduce their heretical spirit into Christian minds. For they wish to annul the

[6] This Decree is also here translated from the original in Hilary, who has besides preserved the "Catholic Definition" of the Council, in which it professes its adherence to the Creed of Nicæa, and, in opposition to the Sirmian Confession which the Arians had proposed, acknowledges in particular both the word and the meaning of "substance:" "substantiæ nomen et rem, à multis sanctis Scripturis insinuatam mentibus nostris, obtinere debere sui firmitatem." Fragm. vii. 3.

formulary drawn up at Nicæa, which was framed against the Arian and the other heresies. They have presented to us besides a creed drawn up by themselves, which we could not lawfully receive. Even before this have they been pronounced heretics by us, and this has been confirmed by a long period,—whom we have not admitted to our communion, but by our separate voices condemned in their own presence. Now then, give your judgment on this matter afresh, that it may be ratified by the subscription of each. Ed. Ben. § 10—11.

"All the Bishops answered—It seems good to us that the aforenamed heretics should be condemned, that the Church may remain in that unshaken faith, which is truly Catholic, and in perpetual peace."

Matters at Ariminum then had this speedy issue; for there was no disagreement there, but all the Fathers with one accord both put into writing what they decided upon, and deposed the Arians.[7]

15. Meanwhile the transactions in Seleucia the Rocky were as follows: it was in the month called by the Romans September, by the Egyptians Thoth, and by the Mace-

[7] Athanasius seems to have known no more of the proceedings at Ariminum, which perhaps were then in progress, when he wrote this Treatise; their termination, as is well known, was very unhappy, "Ingemuit totus orbis," says St. Jerome, "et Arianum se esse miratus est," ad. Lucif. 19. A deputation of ten persons was sent from the Council to Constantius, to which Valens opposed one of his own. Constantius pretended the barbarian war, and delayed an answer till the beginning of October, the Council having opened in May. The Postscript to this Treatise contained the news of this artifice and of the Council's distress in consequence, which Athanasius had just heard. This he also seems to have inserted into his work, infr. pp. 118–122, upon the receipt of the news of the mission of Valens to Constantinople, a mission which ended in the giving way of the Catholic delegacy. Upon his returning to Ariminum with the delegates and the Arian creed they had signed (vid. infr.), Valens, partly by menaces and partly by sophistry, succeeded in procuring the subscriptions of the Council also to the same formula.

CHAP. II.

donians Gorpiæus,[8] and the day of the month according to the Egyptians the 16th, upon which all the members of the Council assembled together. And there were present about a hundred and sixty; and whereas there were many who were accused among them, and their accusers were crying out against them, thereupon Acacius, and Patrophilus, and Uranius of Tyre, and Eudoxius, who usurped the Church of Antioch, and Leontius, and Theodotus, and Evagrius, and Theodulus,[9] and George who has been driven from the whole world, pursue an unprincipled course. Fearing the proofs which their accusers had to show against them, they employed for their purpose the other section of the Arian party, those hirelings of impiety, who had been ordained by that Secundus, whom the great Council had deposed,—such men as the Libyan Stephen, and Seras, and Pollux, who were under accusation upon various charges, next Pancratius, and one Ptolemy a Meletian. Accordingly, to divert the Fathers from the consideration of the charges lying against them, they made a pretence of discussing the

[8] Gorpiæus was the first month of the Syro-Macedonic year among the Greeks, dating according to the era of the Seleucidæ. The Roman date of the meeting of the Council was the 27th of September. The original transactions at Ariminum had at this time been finished as much as two months, and its deputies were waiting for Constantius at Constantinople.

[9] There is little to observe of these Acacian Bishops in addition to what has already been said of several of them, except that George is the Cappadocian, the notorious intruder into the see of S. Athanasius. The charges which lay against them were of various kinds. Socrates says that the Acacian party consisted in all of about 36; other writers increase it by a few more. The Eusebian or Court party is here called Acacian, and was Anomœan and Semi-arian alternately, or more properly as it may be called Homœan or Scriptural; for Arians, Semi-arians, and Anomœans, all used theological terms as well as the Catholics. The Semi-arians numbered about 100, the remaining dozen might be the Egyptian Bishops who were zealous supporters of the Catholic cause. However, there were besides a few Anomœans, or Arians, as Athan. calls them, with whom the Acacians now coalesced.

question of faith, but it was clear they were doing so from fear of their accusers; and they took the part of the heresy, till at length they were left by themselves. For, whereas the supporters of the Acacians lay under suspicion and were very few, but the others were the majority, therefore the Acacians, acting with the boldness of desperation, altogether denied the Nicene formula, and censured the Nicene Council, while the others, who were the majority, accepted the whole proceedings of the great Council, except that they complained of the word, "Consubstantial," as obscure and open to suspicion. When then time passed there, and the accusers pressed, and the accused put in pleas, and thereby were led on further by their impiety and blasphemed the Lord, thereupon the majority of Bishops became indignant, and deposed Acacius, Patrophilus, Uranius, Eudoxius, and George the contractor,[1] and others from Asia, Leontius and Theodosius, Evagrius and Theodulus, and excommunicated Asterius, Eusebius, Augarus, Basilicus, Phœbus, Fidelius, Eutychius, and Magnus. And this the Bishops did on their non-appearance, when summoned to defend themselves on charges which numbers preferred against them. And they decreed that so they should remain, until they made their defence and cleared themselves of the charges brought against them. And after despatching the sentence pronounced against them to the diocese of each, they proceeded to Constantius, that most impious Augustus, to report to him their proceedings, as they had been ordered. And this was the termination of the Council in Seleucia.

Ed. Ben. § 12.

16. Who then but must approve of the conscientious conduct of the Bishops who met at Ariminum? who endured such fatigue of journey and perils of sea, that by a sacred and canonical resolution they might depose

[1] Pork contractor to the troops. Hist. Arian. 75, Naz. Orat. 21, 16.

CHAP. II. the Arians, and guard inviolate the definitions of the Fathers. For each of them felt that, if they undid the acts of their predecessors, they were affording a pretext to their successors to undo what they themselves then were enacting. And who but must condemn such sleight of hand as exercised by the party of Eudoxius and Acacius, who sacrifice the honour due to their own fathers to partisanship and patronage of the Ario-maniacs? for what confidence can be placed in their own acts, if the acts of their fathers be undone? or how call they them Fathers and themselves their successors, if they set about impeaching their judgment? and especially what can Acacius say of his own master, Eusebius,[2] who not only gave his subscription in the Nicene Council, but even in a letter signified to his flock, that that was true faith, which the Council had declared? for, even if he explained himself in that letter in his own way, yet he did not contradict the Council's terms, but even charged it upon the Arians, that their statement that the Son was not before His generation was not even consistent with His being before Mary.

17. What then will they now teach the people who have received their past teaching from them? that the Fathers have made a slip? and how are they themselves to be trusted by those whom they now teach not to follow their own Teachers? and with what faces too will they look upon the sepulchres of the Fathers whom they now name heretics? And why do they abuse the Valentinians, Phrygians, and Manichees, yet give the name of saint to those whom they themselves think probably to have made parallel statements? or how can they any longer be Bishops, if they were ordained by persons whom they now accuse of heresy? But if these were heterodox and their definitions misled the world, then let their memory perish

[2] Vid. supr. pp. 15 and 55.

altogether; and while you are casting out their books, go and cast out their relics too from the cemeteries, so that one and all may know that they are seducers, and that you are parricides. The blessed Apostle approves of the Corinthians because, he says, *ye remember me in all things and keep the traditions as I delivered them to you;* but they, as entertaining such thoughts of their predecessors, will have the daring to say to their flocks just the reverse: "We praise you, not for 'remembering' your fathers, but rather we make much of you, when you do not 'hold their traditions.'" And let them go on to cast a slur on their own ignoble birth, and say, "We are sprung, not of religious men but of heretics." For such language, as I said before, is consistent in those who barter the good name of their Fathers and their own salvation for Arianism, and fear not the words of the divine proverb, *There is a generation that curseth their father*, and the threat lying in the Law against such. Ed. Ben. § 13—14.

18. They then, from zeal for the heresy, are of this obstinate temper: you, however, be not troubled at it, nor take their audacity for truth. For they dissent from each other, and, whereas they have revolted from the Fathers, are of no one opinion, but float about with various and contrary changes.[3] And, as quarrelling with the Council of Nicæa, they have in consequence themselves held many Councils, and have published a faith in each of them, but have stood to none,—nay, they will never act otherwise, for, seeking perversely, they will never find that Wisdom which in truth they hate. I have accordingly subjoined portions both of Arius's writings, and of whatever else I could collect, of their publications in different Councils; whereby you will learn and wonder how it is that they can stand out against an Ecumenical Council and their own Fathers, without being overwhelmed by the effort.

[3] Vid. Append. *Arian leaders, Chameleons, &c.*

Chapter III.

Chap. III.

19. Arius and his friends thought and professed thus: "God made the Son out of nothing, and called Him His Son;" "The Word of God is one of the creatures;" and "Once He was not;" and "He is alterable; capable, when it is His will, of altering." Accordingly they were expelled from the Church by Alexander of blessed memory. However, Arius after his expulsion, when he was living near the party of Eusebius, drew up his heresy upon paper, and imitating, in the character of his music, as if on a festive occasion, no grave writer, but the Egyptian Sotades, he writes at great length, for instance as follows:—

20. *Blasphemies of Arius.*

God Himself then, in His own nature, is ineffable by all men.
Equal or like Himself He alone has none, nor one in glory.
And Ingenerate we call Him, because of Him who is generate by nature.
We praise Him as Unoriginate because of Him who has an origin.
And adore Him as everlasting, because of Him who was born in time.
The Unoriginate made the Son an origin of things that were brought into being;
And advanced Him as a Son to Himself, begetting Him to be such.
He has nothing proper to God in His proper subsistence;
For He is not equal, no, nor consubstantial with Him.
Wise is God, for He is the teacher of Wisdom.
There is full proof that God is invisible to all beings,
Both to things which are through the Son, and to the Son is He invisible

I will say it expressly, how by the Son is seen the Invisible; ED. BEN. § 15.

By that power by which God sees, and in His own measure,

Doth the Son endure to see the Father, as is lawful.

Thus there is a Triad, not in equal glories.

Not intermingling with each other are their subsistences.

One more glorious than the other in their glories unto immensity.

Foreign to the Son in substance is the Father, for He is Unoriginate.

Understand that the Monad was; but the Dyad was not, before it was in existence.

It follows at once that, when the Son was not, the Father is already God.

Hence the Son, not being, (for He existed at the will of the Father,)

Is God Only-begotten, and each is foreign from either.

Wisdom existed as Wisdom by the will of the Wise God.

Hence He is conceived in numberless conceptions.

Spirit, Power, Wisdom, God's glory, Truth, Image, and Word.

Understand that He is conceived to be Radiance and Light.

One equal to the Son, the Supreme is able to generate.

But more excellent, or superior, or greater, He is not able.

At God's will the Son is what and whatsoever He is.

And when and since He was, from that time He has subsisted from God.

He, being a strong God, praises in His degree the Supreme.

To speak in brief, God is ineffable to His Son.

For He is to Himself what He is, that is, unspeakable.

So that nothing which relates to comprehension

CHAP. III. Does the Son understand to speak about; for it is impossible for Him

To investigate the Father who is by Himself.
For the Son Himself does not know His own substance,
For, being Son, He really existed at the will of the Father.
How can it reasonably be, that He who is from the Father
Should know His own Parent by comprehension?
For it is plainly impossible that what hath an origin
Should conceive how the Unoriginate is,
Or should grasp the idea of Him.

21. And what they wrote by letter to Alexander of blessed memory, the Bishop, runs as follows:—

To our Blessed Pope[4] *and Bishop, Alexander, the Presbyters and Deacons send health in the Lord.*

Our faith from our forefathers, which also we have learned from thee, Blessed Pope, is this:—We acknowledge one God, alone Ingenerate, alone Everlasting, alone Unoriginate, alone True, alone having Immortality, alone Wise, alone Good, alone Sovereign; Judge, Governor, and Providence of all, unalterable and unchangeable, just and good, God Law and Prophets and New Testament; who generated an Only-begotten Son before eternal times, through whom He has made both the ages and the universe; and generated Him, not in seeming, but in truth; and that He made Him subsist at His own will, unalterable and

[4] *πάπᾳ*. Alexander is also so called, Theod. Hist. i. 4, p. 749. Athanatius, Hieron. contr. Joan. 4. Heraclas, also of Alexandria, by Dionysius apud Euseb. Hist. vii. 7. Epiphanius of Cyprus, Hieron. Ep. 57, 2. John of Jerusalem, Hier. contr. Joan. 4. Cyprian of Carthage, Ep. ap. Cypr. 31. Augustine of Hippo, Hier. Ep. 141 init. Lupus, Pragmatius, Leontius, Theoplastus, Eutropius, &c. of Gaul, by Sidon. Apoll. Epp. vii. 5, &c. Eutyches, Archimandrite, Abraham Abbot, are called by the same name, in the acts of Chalcedon.

unchangeable; perfect creature of God, but not as one of the creatures; offspring, but not as one of things brought into being; nor, as Valentinus pronounced, is the offspring of the Father an issue; nor, as Manichæus taught, is the offspring a consubstantial portion of the Father; nor is He as Sabellius said, dividing the One, a Son-and-Father;[5] nor as Hieracas speaks of one torch from another, or as a lamp divided into two; nor was He who was before, afterwards generated or new-created into a Son, a notion which, when advanced, thou too thyself, Blessed Pope, in the midst of the Church and in Session hast often condemned; but, as we say, at the will of God, created before times and before ages, and possessing life and being from the Father, who gave subsistence to His glories together with Himself. For the Father did not, in giving to Him the inheritance of all things, deprive Himself of what He has ingenerately in Himself; for He is the fountain of all things. ED. BEN. § 15—16.

"Thus there are Three Subsistences. And God, being the cause of all things, is Unoriginate and altogether Sole; but the Son, being generated apart from time by the Father, and being created and established before ages, was not before His generation, but being generated apart from time before all things, He alone subsisted by the act of the Father. For He is not eternal or co-eternal or co-ingenerate with the Father, nor has He His being together with the Father, as some speak of relations,[6] introducing two ingenerate origins, but God is before all things as being a One and an Origin of all. Wherefore also He is before the Son; as we have learned

[5] Vid. Append. *προβολή, υἱοπατώρ*, &c.

[6] The phrase *τὰ πρός τι* Bull well explains to refer to the Catholic truth that the Father or Son being named, the Other is therein implied without naming. Defens. F. N. iii. 9, § 4. Hence Arius, in his Letter to Eusebius, complains that Alexander says, *ἀεὶ ὁ θεὸς, ἀεὶ ὁ υἱός. ἅμα πατὴρ, ἅμα υἱός.* Theod. Hist. i. 4.

CHAP. III. also from thy preaching in the midst of the Church. So far then as from God He has His being, and His glories, and His life, and all things are delivered unto Him, in such sense is God His origin, for He is above Him, as being His God and before Him. But if the terms *from Him* and *from the womb*, and *I come forth from the Father, and I am come*, be understood by some to mean as if a consubstantial part of Him, or as an issue, then the Father is according to them compounded and divisible and alterable and material, and, as far as their belief goes, has the circumstances of a body, who is the Incorporeal God."

This is a part of what the Arians vomited from their heretical hearts.

22. And before the Nicene Council took place, similar statements were made by Eusebius's party, Narcissus, Patrophilus, Maris, Paulinus, Theodotus, and Athanasius of Nazarba. And Eusebius of Nicomedia wrote over and above to Arius, to this effect, "Since your views are right, pray that all may adopt them; for it is plain to any one, that what has been made was not before its generation; but what came to be, has an origin of being." And Eusebius of Cæsarea in Palestine, in a letter to Euphration the Bishop, did not scruple to say plainly that Christ was not true God. And Athanasius of Nazarba uncloaked the heresy still further, saying that the Son of God was one of the hundred sheep. For, writing to Alexander the Bishop, he had the extreme audacity to say: "Why complain of the Arian party, for saying, The Son of God is made as a creature out of nothing, and one among others? For, all that are made being represented in parable by the hundred sheep, the Son is one of them. If then the hundred are not created and brought into existence, or if there be beings beside that hundred, then may the Son be not a creature nor one among others; but if those hundred are all brought into being, and there is nothing besides the

hundred save God alone, what extravagance do the Arians utter, when, as comprehending and reckoning Christ in the hundred, they say that He is one among others?" And George who now is in Laodicea, and then was presbyter of Alexandria, and was staying at Antioch, wrote to Alexander the Bishop, "Do not complain of the Arians, for saying, 'Once the Son of God was not,' for Esaias came to be Son of Amos, and, whereas Amos was before Esaias came into being, Esaias was not before, but came into being afterwards." And he wrote to the Arians, "Why complain of Alexander your Father, saying, that the Son is from the Father? for you too need not fear to say that the Son was from God. For if the Apostle wrote, *All things are from God*, and it is plain that all things are made of nothing, therefore, though the Son too is a creature and one of things made, still He may be said to be from God in that sense in which all things are said to be from God." From him then the Arians learned to be hypocrites, professing indeed the phrase *from God*, but not in a right sense.[7] And George himself was deposed by Alexander for certain reasons, and among them for manifest impiety; for he was himself a presbyter, as has been said before. Ed. Ben. § 16—18.

23. In a word, then, such were their statements, as if they all were in dispute and rivalry with each other which should make the heresy more impious, and display it in a more naked form. And as for their letters, I have them not at hand, to despatch them to you; else I would have sent you copies; but, if the Lord will, this too I will do, when I get possession of them. And one Asterius from Cappadocia, a many-headed[8] Sophist, one of the Eusebians, whom they could not advance into the Clergy, as having sacrificed in the former persecution in the time

[7] Vid. supr. p. 36, and Eusebius, ibid. 51, 52.

[8] Viz. like the hydra.

CHAP. III. of Constantius's grandfather, writes, with the countenance of the Eusebians, a sort of a treatise, which was on a par with the crime of his sacrifice, but answered their purpose; for in it, after placing the locust and the caterpillar with or rather before Christ, and saying that Wisdom in God was other than Christ, and was the Framer as well of Christ as of the world, he went round the Churches in Syria and elsewhere, with introductions from the Eusebians, that, as he had once been at pains to deny the truth so now he might make free with it. This audacious man intruded himself into forbidden places, and seating himself in the place set apart for Clerks,[9] he read publicly this treatise of his, in spite of the general indignation. It includes many matters at great length, but portions of it are as follows:—

Passage from the Arian Asterius.

"For the Blessed Paul said not that he preached Christ, His, that is, God's 'own power' or 'Wisdom,' but without the article, *a power of God and a Wisdom of God*, thus preaching that the proper power of God Himself, which is connatural and co-existent with Him ingenerately, is something distinct, generative indeed of Christ, creative of the whole world, concerning which he teaches in his Epistle to the Romans, thus, *The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things which are made, even His eternal Power and Godhead.* For as no one would say that the Godhead there mentioned was Christ, instead of the Father Himself,

[9] None but the Clergy might enter the Chancel, i.e. in Service time. Hence Theodosius was made to retire by St. Ambrose. Theod. v. 17. The Council of Laodicea, said to be held A.D. 372, forbids any but persons in orders, ἱερατικοὶ, to enter the Chancel and then communicate. Can. 19, vid. also 44, Conc. t. 1, p. 788, 789. It is doubtful what orders the word ἱερατικοὶ is intended to include. Vid. Bingham Antiq. viii. 6, § 7.

so, as I think, His eternal power is also not the Only-begotten God, but the Father who begat Him. ——— And he tells us of another Power and Wisdom of God, namely, that which is manifested through Christ, and made known through the works themselves of His Ministry." ED. BEN. § 18.

And again :—

Another Passage.

"Although His eternal Power and Wisdom, which the reasonings of Truth determine to be Unoriginate and Ingenerate, would appear certainly to be one and the same, yet many are those powers which are one by one created by Him, of which Christ is the First-born and Only-begotten. All, however, equally depend upon their Possessor, and all His powers are rightly called His, who has created and uses them; for instance, the Prophet says that the locust, which became a divine punishment of human sins, was called by God Himself, not only the power of God, but the great power. And the blessed David, too, in many of the Psalms, invites, not Angels alone, but Powers also to praise God. And while he invites them all to the hymn of praise, he presents before us their multitude, and is not unwilling to call them ministers of God, and teaches that they do His will."

24. These bold words against the Saviour did not content him, but he went further in his blasphemies, as follows:—

Another Passage.

"The Son is one among others; for He is first of things made, and singular among intellectual natures; and as in things visible the sun is one among such as show themselves, and it shines upon the whole world according to the command of its Maker, so the Son, being one among intellectual natures, also enlightens and shines upon all that are in the intellectual world."

CHAP. III. And again he says, Once He was not, writing thus:—"And before the Son's generation, the Father had pre-existing knowledge how to generate; since a physician, too, before he cured, had the science of curing." And he says again: "The Son was created by God's earnest beneficence; and the Father made Him by the superabundance of His Power." And again: "If the will of God has pervaded all the works in succession, certainly the Son too, being a work, has at His will come into being and been made." Now though Asterius was the only person to write all this, the Eusebians felt the like in common with him.

25. These are the doctrines for which they are contending; for these they assail the Ancient Council, because its members did not propound the like, but anathematised the Arian heresy instead, which these men were so eager to recommend. On this account they put forward, as an advocate of their impiety, Asterius who had sacrificed, a sophist too, that he might not spare whether to speak against the Lord, or by a show of reason to mislead the simple. And they were ignorant, the shallow men, that they were doing harm to their own cause. For the ill savour of their advocate's idolatrous sacrifice, betrayed still more plainly that the heresy is Christ's foe. And now again, the general agitations and troubles which they are exciting, are in consequence of their belief, that if they commit enough murders, and hold synods enough month after month, at length they will succeed in repealing the sentence which has been passed against the Arian heresy. But here, too, they seem ignorant, or to pretend ignorance, that even before Nicæa that heresy was held in abomination when Artemas[10] was laying its foundations, and before

[10] Artemas or Artemon was one of the chiefs of a school of heresy at Rome at the end of the second century. Theodotus was another, and the more eminent. They founded separate sects. Their

him at the time of Caiaphas's assembly and that of the Pharisees his contemporaries. And at all times is this workshop of Christ's foes abominable, and will not cease to be hateful, while the Lord's Name inspires love, and the whole creation bows the knee, and confesses *that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.*

Chapter IV.

26. Yet so it is, they have convened successive Councils[1] against that Ecumenical One, and are not yet tired.[2] After

main tenet is what would now be called Unitarianism, or that our Lord was a mere man. Artemas seems to have been more known in the East; at least is more frequently mentioned in controversy with the Arians, e.g. by Alexander, Theod. Hist. i. 3, p. 739.

[1] The enumeration of Councils and Creeds after the Nicene, which follows, brings before us very clearly the point in controversy between Catholics and Eusebians. It was not the question of our Lord's divinity; this had not required settling even at Nicæa in 325. The assembled Bishops at once reprobated the heresies of Arius, but they found that, whereas the heretics in fact and in heart denied Him to be more than the first of creatures, they could hide their tenet in such ambiguous phrases, and recommend it by such pretentious concessions and embellishments, and throw it back into such implicit forms, as to need, if it was to be excluded from the Church, some new, special, discriminating test in the professions of faith which the Church enforced. Such, and such alone, was the Homoüsion; both parties acknowledged this; in this they joined issue. The aim then of the Eusebians in these successive Councils was to delude the Bishops of East or West into giving up this test, (which the Nicene Fathers had inserted into the Creed,) maintaining for that purpose that it was not necessary, and nothing but the destruction of that happy peace which at length after the trials of three centuries Christians had won, and that Athanasius was the arch-enemy of the Church's welfare, and must be summarily put down.

[2] It will be observed that the Eusebian or court party from 341 to 358, contained in it two elements, the more religious or Semi-arian which tended to Catholicity, and ultimately coalesced with it, the other the proper Arian or Anomœan, which was essentially heretical. During the period mentioned, it wore for the most part the Semi-arian profession. Athanasius as well as Hilary does justice to the real Semi-arians; but Athanasius does not seem to have known or estimated the quarrel between them and the Arians as fully as Hilary. Accordingly, while the former is bent in this

CHAP. IV. the Nicene, the Eusebians had been deposed; however, in course of time they intruded themselves without shame upon the Churches, and began to plot against the Bishops who withstood them, and to place in the sees men of their own heresy instead. Thus they thought to be able to hold Councils at their pleasure, as having those who concurred with them, and whom they had ordained on purpose for this very object. Accordingly, they assemble at Jerusalem,[3] and there they write thus:—

"The Holy Council assembled in Jerusalem by the grace of God, to the Church of God which is in Alexandria, and to all throughout Egypt, Thebais, Libya, and Pentapolis, also to the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons throughout the world, health in the Lord.

"To all of us who have come together into one place from different provinces, to the great celebration, which we have held at the consecration of the Saviour's Martyry,[4]

treatise in bringing out the great fact of the variations of the heretical party, Hilary, wishing to commend the hopeful Semi-arians to the Gallic Church, makes excuses for them, on the ground of the *necessity* of explanations of the Nicene formulary, "necessitatem hanc furor hereticus imponit." Hil. de Syn. 63, vid. also 62 and 28. At the same time, Ath. (as will be seen infr. ch. vi.) treats individual Semi-arians with most considerate forbearance, and Hilary himself bears witness quite as strongly as Athan. to the miserable variations of the heretical party, as Nazianzen in his well-known declaration against Councils, "Never saw I Council brought to a useful issue, nor remedying, but rather increasing existing evils." Ep. 130.

[3] This Council at Jerusalem was a continuation of one held at Tyre at which Athan. was condemned. It was very numerously attended; by Bishops (as Eusebius says, Vit. Const. iv. 43), from Macedonia, Pannonia, Thrace, Asia Minor, Syria, Arabia, Egypt, and Libya. One account speaks of the number as being above 200. Eus. says that an "innumerable multitude from all provinces accompanied them." It was the second great Council in Constantine's reign, and is compared by Eusebius (invidiously) to the Nicene, c. 47. At this Council Arius was solemnly received, as the Synodal Letter goes on to say.

[4] This Church, called the Martyry or Testimony, was built over the spot made sacred by our Lord's death, burial, and resurrection, in commemoration of the discovery of the Holy Cross, and

built in honour of God the King of all, and of His Christ, by the zeal of the most religious Emperor Constantine, the grace of Christ provided an increase of gratification, in the conduct of that most religious Emperor himself, who, by letters of his own, to the banishing from the Church of God of all jealousy, and driving far away all slander, which has caused division among the members of Christ for a long season, urged us, what was our duty, with open and peaceable mind to receive Arius and his friends, whom for a while jealousy which hates virtue had contrived to expel from the Church. And the most religious Emperor bore testimony in their behalf by his letter to the exactness of their faith, which, after inquiry of them, and personal communication with them by word of mouth, he acknowledged and made known to us, subjoining to his own letters their orthodox teaching in writing,[5] which we all confess to be sound and ecclesiastical. And he reasonably recommended that they should be received and united to the Church of God, as you will know yourselves from the transcript of the same Epistle, which we have transmitted to your reverences. We believe that yourselves also, as if recovering the very

has been described from Eusebius in the preface to the Translation of S. Cyril's Catechetical Lectures, p. xxiv. It was begun A.D. 326, and dedicated at this date, A.D. 335, on Saturday, the 13th of September. The 14th, however, is the feast of the Exaltatio S. Crucis both in East and West.

[5] This is supposed to be the Confession which is preserved by Socr. i. 26, and Soz. ii. 27, and was presented to Constantine by Arius in 330. It says no more than "And in the Lord Jesus Christ His Son, who was begotten from Him before all the ages God and Word, through whom all things were made, both in the heavens and upon earth;" afterwards it professes to have "received the faith from the holy Evangelists," and to believe "as all the Catholic Church and as the Scriptures teach." The Synodal Letter in the text adds "apostolical tradition and teaching." Arius might safely appeal to Scripture and the Church for a creed which did not specify the point in controversy. In his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia before the Nicene Council, where he does state the distinctive articles of his heresy, he appeals to him as a fellow pupil in the School of Lucian, not to tradition. Theod. Hist. i. 4.

CHAP. IV. members of your own body, will experience great joy and gladness, in acknowledging and recovering your own bowels, your own brethren and fathers; since not only the Presbyters who are friends of Arius are given back to you, but also the whole Christian people and the entire multitude, which on occasion of the aforesaid men have a long time been in dissension among you. Moreover it were fitting, now that you know for certain what has passed, and that the men have communicated with us and have been received by so Holy a Council, that you should with all readiness hail this your coalition and peace with your own members, specially seeing that the articles of the faith which they have published preserve indisputable the universally confessed apostolical tradition and teaching."

27. This was the first of their Councils, and in it they were prompt in divulging their purpose, and could not conceal it. For when, after the expulsion of Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, they said they had banished all jealousy, and went on to recommend the reception of Arius and his friends, they showed that their measures, whether against Athanasius himself then, or against all the other protesting Bishops before, had for their object to restore the Arians, and to introduce the heresy into the Church. However, although they had sanctioned in this Council all Arius's malignity, and had given their directions to receive his party into communion, of which they had set the example, yet feeling that even now they had not done enough for their purpose, they assembled a Council at Antioch under colour of the so-called Dedication;[6] and,

[6] i.e. the dedication of the Dominicum Aureum, which had been ten years in building. Vid. the description of it in Euseb. Vit. Const. iii. 50. This Council is one of great importance in the history, though it was not attended by more than 90 Bishops according to Ath. infr., or 97 according to Hilary de Syn. 28. The Eusebians had written to the Roman see against Athan., and eventually called on it to summon a Council. Accordingly, Julius proposed a

since they were in general and lasting odium for their heresy, they published divers letters, some of this sort and some of that; and this is what they wrote in one of them :— Ed. Ben. § 21—22.

First Confession, at Antioch.

"We have not been followers of Arius,—how, Bishops as we are, could we follow a Presbyter?—nor did we receive any other faith beside that which has been handed down from the beginning.[7] But after taking on ourselves to examine and to verify his faith, we have admitted him rather than follow him; as you will understand from our present avowals.

"For we have been taught from the first, to believe in one God, the God of the Universe, the Framer and Providence of all things both intellectual and sensible.

"And in One Son of God, Only-begotten, existing before all ages, and being with the Father who begat Him, by whom all things were made, both visible and invisible, who in the last days according to the good pleasure of the Father came down, and took flesh of the Virgin, and fulfilled all His Father's will; and suffered and rose again, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, and cometh again to judge

Council at Rome; they refused to come, and instead held this meeting at Antioch. Twenty-five Canons are attributed to this Council, which have been received into the Code of the Catholic Church, though not as *from* this Council, which took at least some of them from more ancient sources. It is remarkable that S. Hilary calls this Council an assembly of Saints, de Syn. 32, but it is his course throughout to look at these Councils on their hopeful side. Vid. note [2].

[7] The Council might safely appeal to antiquity, since, with Arius in the Confession noticed supr. note [5], they did not touch on the point in dispute. The number of their formularies, three or four, shows that they had a great difficulty in taking any view which would meet the wishes and express the sentiments of one and all. The one that follows, which is their first, is as meagre as Arius's, quoted note [5].

CHAP. IV. quick and dead, and remaineth King and God unto all ages.

"And we believe also in the Holy Ghost; and if it be necessary to add, we believe the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh, and the life everlasting."

28. Here follows what they published next at the same Dedication in another Epistle, being dissatisfied with the first, and devising something newer and fuller:—

Second Confession,[8] *at Antioch.*

"We believe, conformably to the evangelical and apostolical tradition, in One God, the Father Almighty, the Framer, and Maker, and Providence of the Universe, from whom are all things.

"And in One Lord Jesus Christ, His Son, the Only-begotten God, through whom are all things, who was begotten before all ages from the Father, God from God, whole from whole,[9] sole from sole, perfect from perfect, King

[8] This formulary is that known as *the* Formulary of the Dedication. It is quoted as such by Socr. ii. 39, 40. Soz. iv. 15, and infr. § 29. Sozomen says that the Eusebians attributed it to Lucian, alleging that they had found a copy written by his own hand; but he decides neither for or against it himself. Hist. iii. 5. And the Auctor de Trinitate (in Theodoret's works, t. 5), allows that it is Lucian's, but interpolated. Dial. iii. init. vid. Routh, Reliq. Sacr. vol. iii. p. 294-6, who is in favour of its genuineness; as are Bull, Cave, and S. Basnage. Tillemont and Coustant take the contrary side; the latter observing (ad Hilar. de Synod. 28) that Athanasius, speaks of parts of it as Acacius's, and that Acacius attributes its language to Asterius. The Creed is of a much higher cast of doctrine than the two former, containing some of the phrases which in the fourth century became badges of Semi-arianism.

[9] These strong words and those which follow, whether Lucian's or not, mark the great difference between this confession and the foregoing. It would seem as if the Eusebians had at first tried the assembled Bishops with a negative confession, and finding that they would not accept it, had been forced upon one of a more orthodox character. It is observable too that even the Council of Jerusalem but indirectly received the Confession on which they re-ad-

from King, Lord from Lord, Living Word, Living Wisdom, true Light, Way, Truth, Resurrection, Shepherd, Door, both unalterable and unchangeable, unvarying[1] Image of the Godhead, Substance, Will, Power, and Glory of the Father; the First-born of every creature, who was in the beginning with God, God the Word, as it is written in the Gospel, *And the Word was God;* by whom all things were made, and in whom all things consist; who in the last days descended from above, and was born of a Virgin according to the Scriptures, and was made Man, Mediator between God and man, and Apostle of our faith, and Prince of life, as He says, *I came down from heaven, not to do Mine own will, but the will of Him that sent Me;* who suffered for us and rose again on the third day, and ascended into heaven, and sat down on the right hand of the Father, and is coming again with glory and power, to judge quick and dead. Ed. Ben. § 23.

"And in the Holy Ghost, who is given to those who believe, for comfort, and sanctification, and perfection, as also our Lord Jesus Christ enjoined His disciples, saying, *Go ye, teach all nations, baptising them in the Name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost;* of Father as being truly Father, and of Son as being truly Son, and of the Holy Ghost as being truly Holy Ghost, the names not being given without meaning or effect, but denoting accurately the peculiar subsistence, rank, and glory of each that is named, so that they are three in subsistence, and in agreement one.[2]

mitted Arius, though they gave it a real sanction. The words "unalterable and unchangeable" are formal Anti-arian symbols, as the τρεπτὸν or alterable was one of the most characteristic parts of Arius's creed.

[1] Vid. ἀπαράλλακτος.

[2] This phrase, which is of a more Arian character than any other part of the Confession, is justified by S. Hilary on the ground, that when the Spirit is mentioned, agreement is the best symbol of unity, de Syn. 32 It is protested against in the Sardican Confession. Theod. Hist. ii.

CHAP. IV. "Holding then this faith, and holding it in the presence of God and Christ, from beginning to end, we anathematise every heretical heterodoxy.[3] And if any teaches, beside the sound and right faith of the Scriptures, that time, or season, or age,[4] either is or has taken place before the generation of the Son, be he anathema. Or if any one says, that the Son is a creature, as one of the creatures, or an offspring as one of the offsprings, or a work as one of the works, and does not hold the aforesaid articles one after another, as the divine Scriptures have delivered,[5] or if he teaches or preaches beside what we have received, be he anathema. For all that has been delivered in the divine Scriptures, whether by Prophets or Apostles, do we truly and conscientiously both believe and follow."

29. And one Theophronius,[6] Bishop of Tyana, put forth in their presence the following statement of his personal faith. And they subscribed it, accepting the faith of this man :—

6, p. 846. A similar passage occurs in Origen, contr. Cels. viii. 12, with which Huet. Origen, ii. 2, n. 3, compares Novatian, de Trin. 22. The Arians insisted on the "oneness in agreement" as a fulfilment of such texts as "I and My Father are one;" but this subject will come before us, infr. n. 54, and in Disc. ch. 26.

[3] The whole of these anathemas are an Eusebian addition. The Council anathematises "*every* heretical heterodoxy;" *not*, as Athanasius observes, supr. Arim. 9, the Arian.

[4] The introduction of these words, "time," "age," &c., allows them still to hold the Arian formula "once He was not;" for our Lord was, as they held, *before* time, but still created. Vid. also infr. note [3], p. 103.

[5] This emphatic mention of Scripture is also virtually an Arian evasion; to hold certain truths, "*as* Scripture has delivered," might either mean *because* and *as in fact*, or *so far as*, or *in the sense of* Scripture, and admitted of a silent reference to themselves, as interpreters of Scripture.

[6] Nothing is known of Theophronius; his confession is in great measure a relapse into Arianism proper: that is, as far as the absence of characteristic symbols is a proof of a wish to introduce the heresy. For the phrase "perfect God" vid. Append. τέλειος.

Third Confession, at Antioch.

"God knows, whom I call as a witness upon my soul, that so I believe:—in God the Father Almighty, the Creator and Maker of the Universe, from whom are all things: Ed. Ben. § 23—25.

"And in His Son, the Only-begotten God, Word, Power, and Wisdom, our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things; who was begotten from the Father before the ages, perfect God from perfect God, who was with God in subsistence, and in the last days descended, and was born of the Virgin according to the Scriptures, and was made man, and suffered, and rose again from the dead, and ascended into the heavens, and sat down on the right hand of His Father, and cometh again with glory and power to judge quick and dead, and remaineth for ever:

"And in the Holy Ghost, the Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth, which also God promised by his Prophet to pour out upon His Servants, and the Lord promised to send to His disciples: which also He sent, as the Acts of the Apostles witness.

"But if any one teaches, or holds in his mind, aught beside this faith, be he anathema; or holds with Marcellus of Ancyra, or Sabellius, or Paul of Samosata, be he anathema, both himself and those who communicate with him."

30. Ninety Bishops met at the Dedication under the Consulate of Marcellinus and Probinus, in the 14th of the Indiction,[7] Constantius the most irreligious being present. Having thus conducted matters at Antioch at the Dedication, thinking that their composition was deficient still,

[7] The commencement and the origin of this mode of dating are unknown. It seems to have been introduced between A.D. 313 and 315. The Indiction was a cycle of 15 years, and began with the month of September. St. Athanasius is the first ecclesiastical author who adopts it.

CHAP. IV.

and not altogether clear as to their own view of the doctrine, again they draw up afresh another formulary, after a few months, professedly concerning the faith, and despatch Narcissus, Maris, Theodorus, and Mark into Gaul.[8] And they, as being sent from the Council, deliver the following document to Constans Augustus[9] of blessed memory, and to all who were there :—

Fourth Confession,[1] *at Antioch.*

"We believe in One God, the Father Almighty, Creator

[8] This deputation had it in purpose to gain the Emperor Constans to the Eusebian party. They composed a new Confession with this object. Theodore of Heraclea (who made commentaries on Scripture and is said to have been an elegant writer), Maris and Narcissus, were all Eusebians; but Mark was a Semi-arian. As yet the Eusebian party were making use of the Semi-arians, but their professed Creed had already much degenerated from Lucian's at the Dedication.

[9] Constans had lately become master of two-thirds of the Empire by the death of his elder brother Constantine, who had made war upon him and fallen in an engagement. He was at this time only 22 years of age. His enemies represent his character in no favourable light, but, for whatever reason, he sided with the Catholics; and S. Athanasius, who had been honourably treated by him in Gaul, speaks of him in the language of gratitude. In his Apology to Constantius, he says, "thy brother of blessed memory filled the churches with offerings," and he speaks of the "grace given him through baptism," § 7. Constans was murdered by Magnentius in A.D. 350, and one of the calumnies against Athan. was that he had sent letters to the murderer.

[1] The 4th, 5th, and 6th Confessions are the same, and with these agrees the (Arian) Creed of Philippopolis (A.D. 347, or 344 according to Mansi). These extend over a period of nine years A.D. 342—351 (or 15 or 16 according to Baronius and Mansi, who place the 6th Confession, i.e. the 1st Sirmian, at 357, 358 respectively), and form the stationary period of Arianism. The two parties of which the heretical body was composed were kept together, not only by the court, but by the rise of the Sabellianism of Marcellus (A.D. 335) and Photinus (about 342). This too would increase their strength in the Church, and is the excuse, which Hilary himself urges, for their frequent Councils. Still they do not seem to be able to escape from the argument of Athanasius, that, whereas new Councils are for new heresies, if only one new heresy had risen, only one new Council was necessary. If these four Confessions say the same thing, three of them must be superfluous, vid. infr. n. 37, p. 122.

and Maker of all things; from whom all fatherhood in heaven and on earth is named. ED. BEN. § 25.

"And in His Only-begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, who before all ages was begotten from the Father, God from God, Light from Light, through whom all things were made in the heavens and on the earth, visible and invisible, being Word, and Wisdom, and Power, and Life, and True Light; who in the last days was made man for us, and was born of the Holy Virgin; who was crucified, and dead, and buried, and who rose again from the dead the third day, and was taken up into heaven, and sat down on the right hand of the Father; and is coming at the end of the world, to judge quick and dead, and to render to every one according to his works; whose Kingdom endures indissolubly into infinite ages; for He shall be seated on the right hand of the Father, not only in this world but in that which is to come.

"And in the Holy Ghost, that is, the Paraclete; whom, having promised to the Apostles, He sent forth after His ascension into heaven, to teach them and to remind them of all things; through whom also shall be sanctified the souls of those who sincerely believe in Him.

"But those who say, that the Son was from nothing, or from other subsistence and not from God, and, there was time when He was not, the Catholic Church regards as aliens." [2]

However, in spite of the identity of their Creed, the difference in their Anathemas is very great, as we shall see.

[2] S. Hilary, vid. Theol. Tracts, p. 81, by implication calls this the Nicene Anathema; and so it is in the respects in which he speaks of it; but it omits many of the Nicene clauses, and with them the condemnation of many of the Arian articles. The especial point which it evades is our Lord's eternal existence, substituting for "once He was not," "there was *time* when He was not," and leaving out "before His generation He was not," "created," "alterable," and "mutable." It seems to have been considered sufficient for Gaul, as worded here; for Italy, as in the 5th Confession or Macrostich; and for Africa, as in the Creed of Philippopolis.

CHAP. IV. 31. As if dissatisfied with this, they hold their meeting again after three years, and dispatch Eudoxius, Martyrius, and Macedonius of Cilicia, and some others with them, to the parts of Italy, to carry with them a faith written at great length, with numerous additions over and above those which had gone before. They went abroad with these, as if they had discovered something new.

Fifth Confession or Macrostich.

"We believe in one God the Father Almighty, the Creator and Maker of all things, from whom all fatherhood in heaven and on earth is named.

"And in His Only-begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ, who before all ages was begotten from the Father, God from God, Light from Light, by whom all things were made, in heaven and on the earth, visible and invisible, being Word, and Wisdom, and Power, and Life, and True Light, who in the last days was made man for us, and was born of the Holy Virgin, crucified and dead and buried, and who rose again from the dead the third day, and was taken up into heaven, and sat down on the right hand of the Father, and is coming at the end of the world to judge quick and dead, and to render to every one according to his works, whose Kingdom endures unceasingly unto infinitè ages; for He sitteth on the right hand of the Father not only in this age, but also in that which is to come.

"And we believe in the Holy Ghost, that is, the Paraclete, whom, having promised to the Apostles, He sent forth after the ascension into heaven, to teach them and to remind them of all things: through whom also shall be sanctified the souls of those who sincerely believe in Him.

"But those who say, (1) that the Son was from nothing, or from other subsistence and not from God; (2) and that there was a time or age when He was not, the Catholic

and Holy Church regards as aliens. Likewise those who say, (3) that there are three Gods; (4) or that Christ is not God; (5) or that before the ages He was neither Christ nor Son of God; (6) or that Father and Son, or Holy Ghost, are the same; (7) or that the Son is Ingenerate; (8) or that the Father generated the Son, not by choice or will; the Holy and Catholic Church anathematises. Ed. Ben. § 26.

"(1.) For it is not safe to say either that the Son is from nothing, (since this is nowhere spoken of Him in divinely inspired Scripture,) or again of any other subsistence before existing beside the Father, but from God alone do we define Him genuinely to be generated. For the divine Word teaches that the Ingenerate and Unoriginate, the Father of Christ, is One.[3]

"(2.) Nor may we, adopting the hazardous position, 'There was once when He was not,' from unscriptural sources, imagine any interval of time prior to Him, but only that God generated Him apart from time; for through Him both times and ages came into being. Yet we must not consider the Son to be co-unoriginate and co-ingenerate with the Father; for no one can be properly called father or son of one who is co-unoriginate and co-ingenerate with him.[4] But we acknowledge that the Father, who alone is Unoriginate and Ingenerate, hath generated inconceivably and incomprehensibly; and that the Son hath been generated before ages, and in no wise

[3] It is observable that here and in the next paragraph the only reasons they give against using the only two Arian formulas which they condemn is that they are not found in Scripture, which leaves the question of their truth untouched. Here, in their explanation of the ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, or from nothing, they do but deny it with Eusebius's evasion; that nothing can be from nothing, and every thing must be from God. Vid. Append. *Eusebius.*

[4] They argue, after the usual Arian manner, that the term "Son" essentially implies beginning, and excludes the title "co-unoriginate;" whereas the Catholics contended (supr. p. 85, note [6]), that the word Father implied a continuity of nature, that is, a co-eternal existence with the Father.

CHAP. IV. is ingenerate Himself like the Father, but had as His origin the Father who generated Him; for *the Head of Christ is God.*

"(3.) Nor again, in confessing three[5] realities and three Persons of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost according to the Scriptures, do we therefore make Gods three; since we acknowledge the Self-complete and Ingenerate and Unoriginate and Invisible God to be one only, the God and Father of the Only-begotten, which Father alone hath being from Himself, and alone vouchsafes this to all others bountifully.

"(4.) Nor again in saying that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is one only God, the only Ingenerate; do we therefore deny that Christ also is God before ages: as the disciples of Paul of Samosata, who say that after the incarnation He was by advance[6] made God, from being by nature a mere man. For we acknowledge, that though He be subordinate to His Father and God, yet, being before ages begotten of God, He is God according to nature perfect and true, and not first man and then God, but first God and then becoming man for us, yet never having ceased to be God.[7]

"(5.) We abhor besides and anathematise those who make a pretence of saying that He is but the mere Word of God and non-existent, having His being in another,—now as if pronounced, as some speak, now as mental,[8]—hold-

[5] *πράγματα καὶ πρόσωπα.*

[6] *ἐκ προκοπῆς*, supr. p. 25, note [1].

[7] These strong words *θεὸν κατὰ φύσιν τέλειον καὶ ἀληθῆ* are of a different character from any which have occurred in the Arian Confessions. They can only be explained away by considering them used *in contrast* to the Samosatene doctrine; Paul saying that that dignity which the Arians ascribed to our Lord before His birth in the flesh, was bestowed on Him after it. Thus "perfect according to nature" and "true," will not be directly connected with "God" so much as opposed to, "by advance," by "adoption," &c. And it may be explained that the gift of grace is a new and divine nature.

[8] Vid. *ἐνδιάθετος, προφορικός*, Append.

ing that He was not Christ or Son of God or Mediator or Image of God before ages; but that He first became Christ and Son of God when He took our flesh from the Virgin, not four hundred years since. For they will have it that then Christ began His Kingdom, and that it will have an end after the consummation of all and the judgment.[9] Such are the disciples of Marcellus and Scotinus[1] of Galatian Ancyra, who, equally with Jews, negative Christ's existence before ages, and His Godhead, and unending Kingdom, upon pretence of supporting the divine Monarchy. We, on the contrary, regard Him not as simply God's pronounced or mental word, but as Living God and Word, existing in Himself, and Son of God and Christ; being and abiding with His Father before ages, and that not in foreknowledge only, and ministering to Him for the entire framing whether of things visible or invisible. For He it is to whom the Father said, *Let us make man in Our image, after Our likeness*, who also was seen in His own Person[2] by the patriarchs, gave the law, spoke by the

Ed. Ben. § 26.

[9] This passage seems taken from Eusebius, and partly from Marcellus's own words, vid. Append. S. Cyril speaks of his doctrine in like terms. Catech. xv. 27.

[1] i.e. Photinus of Sirmium, the pupil of Marcellus, is meant, who published his heresy about 343. A similar play upon words is found in the case of other names; though Lucifer seems to think that his name was really Scotinus and that his friends changed it, de non parc. pp. 203, 220, 226. Thus Noetus is called *ἀνόητος*. Epiph. Hær. 57, 2 fin. and 8, and Eudoxius, *ἀδόξιος*. Lucifer. pro Athan. i. p. 65. Moriend. p. 258. Eunomians among the Latins (by a confusion with Anomœan), *ἄνομοι*, or *sine lege*, Cod. Can. lxi. 1, ap. Leon. Op. t. 3, p. 443. Vigilantius dormitantius, Jerom. contr. Vigil. init. Aerius *ἀέριον πνεῦμα ἔσχεν*. Epiph. Hær. 75, 6 fin. Of Arius, *Ἄρες, ἄρειε*, vid. Append. *Arius*. Gregory, *ὁ νυστάζων*, Anast. Hod. 10, p. 186.

[2] *αὐτοπροσώπως* and so Cyril. Hier. Catech. xv. 14 and 17. He means, "not in personation;" and Philo too contrasting divine appearances with those of Angels; Leg. Alleg. iii. 62. On the other hand, Theophilus on the text, "The voice of the Lord God walking in the garden," speaks of the Word, "assuming the person, *πρόσωπον*, of the Father," and "in the person of God," ad Autol. ii. 22, the word hardly having then its theological sense.

CHAP. IV. Prophets, and at last, became man, and manifested His own Father to all men, and reigns to never-ending ages. For Christ has taken no recent dignity, but we have believed Him to be perfect from the first, and like in all things to the Father.[3]

"(6.) And those who say that the Father and Son and Holy Ghost are the same, and impiously understand the Three Names of one and the same Reality and Person, we justly forbid the Church, because they suppose the illimitable and impassible Father to be limitable withal and passible through His becoming man: for such are they whom the Latins call the Patropassians, and we Sabellians. For we acknowledge that the Father who sent, remained in His own state of unchangeable Godhead, and that Christ who was sent fulfilled the economy of the Incarnation.

"(7.) And at the same time those who irreverently say that the Son was generated, not by choice or will, thus encompassing God with a necessity which excludes choice and purpose, so that He begat the Son unwillingly, we account as most impious and alien to the Church; in that they have dared to define such things concerning God, against the commonly received notions concerning Him, nay, beside the purport of divinely inspired Scripture. For we, knowing that God is absolute and sovereign over Himself, have a religious understanding that He generated the Son voluntarily and freely; yet, as we have a reverent belief in the Son's words concerning Himself, *The Lord hath created Me a beginning of His ways for His works*, we do not understand Him to be generated, like the creatures or works which through Him came into

[3] ὅμοιον κατὰ πάντα. Here again we have a strong Semi-arian or almost Catholic formula introduced by-the-bye, marking the prescence of what may be called the new Semi-arian school. Of course it admitted of evasion, but in its fulness it included "substance."

being. For it is impious and alien to the ecclesiastical faith to compare the Creator with handiworks created by Him, and to think that He has the same manner of birth with the rest. For divine Scripture teaches us really and truly that the Only-begotten Son was generated sole and solely.[4] Ed. Ben. § 26.

"(8.) Yet,[5] in saying that the Son is in Himself, and both lives and exists, like the Father, we do not on that account separate Him from the Father, imagining place and interval between their union in the way of bodies. For we believe that they are united with each other without any intermediate or interval, and that they exist inseparably; all the Father embosoming the Son, and all the Son adhering and clinging to the Father, and alone resting on the Father's breast continually. Believing then in the all-perfect Triad, the most Holy, that is, in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost, and calling the Father God, and the Son God, yet we confess in them, not two Gods, but one dignity of Godhead, and one exact harmony of dominion, the only Father being Head over the whole universe wholly and over the Son Himself; and the Son subordinated to the Father, but, excepting Him, ruling over all things after Him which through Himself have come to be,

[4] The Confession does not here comment on the clause against our Lord's being Ingenerate, having already noticed it under paragraph (2). It will be remarked that it still insists upon the unscripturalness of the Catholic positions. The main subject of this paragraph, the *θελήσει γεννηθέν*, which forms great part of the Arian question and controversy, is reserved for Orat. iii. § 59, &c. (infr. pp. 191—204), in which Athanasius formally treats of it. He treats of the text Prov. viii. 22, in Orat. i. and. ii. (infr. pp. 220—343). The doctrine of the *μονογενὲς* has already partially come before us, supr. pp. 20—22. *Μόνως*, not as the creatures.

[5] This last paragraph is the most curious of the instances of the presence of this new and nameless influence, which seems at this time to have been springing up among the Eusebians, and showed itself by acts before it has a place in history. It is in its very form an interpolation, and adding the *περιχώρησις*, was virtually an admission of the *ὁμοούσιον*.

CHAP. IV. and bestowing the grace of the Holy Ghost bountifully to the holy at the Father's will. For that such is the account of the Divine Monarchy relatively towards Christ, the sacred oracles have delivered to us.

"Thus much, in addition to the faith before published in epitome, we have been compelled to draw forth at greater length, not in any officious display, but to clear away all hostile suspicion concerning our opinions, among those who are ignorant of what we really hold: and that all in the West may know, both the audacity of the slanders of the heterodox, and as to the Orientals, their Christian and ecclesiastical spirit, to which the divinely inspired Scriptures readily bear witness, when readers are not perverse."

32. However, they did not stand even to this; for again at Sirmium[6] they met together[7] against Photinus,[8] and

[6] Sirmium was a city of lower Pannonia, not far from the Danube, and it was the great bulwark of the Illyrian provinces of the Empire. There Vetranio assumed the purple; and there Constantius was born. The frontier war caused it to be from time to time the Imperial residence. We hear of Constantius at Sirmium in the summer of 357. Ammian. xvi. 10. He also passed there the ensuing winter, ibid. xvii. 12. In October, 358, after the Sarmatian war, he entered Sirmium in triumph, and passed the winter there, xvii. 13 fin., and with a short absence in the spring, remained there till the end of May, 359.

[7] For the chronology, &c., of the various Confessions of Sirmium, Petavius must be consulted, who has thrown more light on the subject than any one else. In 351, the Semi-arian party was still stronger than in 345. The leading person in this Council was Basil of Ancyra, who is generally considered their head. Basil held a disputation with Photinus. Silvanus too of Tarsus now appears for the first time; while, according to Socrates, Mark of Arethusa, who was more connected with the Eusebians than any other of his party, drew up the Anathemas; the Confession used was the same as that sent to Constans, that of the Council of Philippopolis, and the Macrostich.

[8] There had been no important Oriental Council held since that of the Dedication ten years before, till this of Sirmium (unless indeed that of Philippopolis requires to be mentioned, which was a secession from the Council of

there composed a Faith again, not drawn out into such length, nor so diffuse; but, subtracting the greater part and adding something else, as if they listened to the suggestions of others, they wrote as follows:— Ed. Ben. § 26–27.

Sixth Confession at Sirmium, (first Sirmian).

"We believe in One God, the Father Almighty, the Creator and Maker of all things, *from whom the whole fatherhood in heaven and earth is named.*

"And in His Only-begotten Son, our Lord Jesus the Christ, who before all the ages was begotten from the Father, God from God, Light from Light, by whom all things were made, in heaven and on the earth, visible and invisible, being Word and Wisdom, and True Light and Life, who in the last days was made man for us, and was

Sardica): S. Hilary treats its creed as a Catholic composition, de Syn. 39—63. Philastrius and Vigilius call the Council a meeting of "holy bishops" and a "Catholic Council," de Hær. 65, and in Eutych. v. init. What gave a character and weight to this Council, which belonged to no other Eusebian meeting, was, that it met to set right a real evil, and was not a mere pretence with Arian objects. Photinus had now been eight or nine years in the open avowal of his heresy, yet in possession of his see. As to the Bishops present at this Sirmian Council, we have them described in Sulpitius: "Part of the Bishops followed Arius, and welcomed the desired condemnation of Athanasius; part, brought together by fear and faction, yielded to a party spirit; a few, to whom faith was dear and truth precious, rejected the unjust judgment." Hist. ii. 52: he instances Paulinus of Treves, whose resistance, however, took place at Milan some years later. Sozomen gives us a similar account, speaking of a date a few years before the Sirmian Council. "The East," he says, "in spite of its being in faction after the Antiochene Council" of the Dedication, "and thenceforth openly dissenting from the Nicene faith, in reality, I think, concurred in the sentiment of the majority, and with them confessed the Son to be of the Father's substance; but, from contentiousness certain of them fought against the term 'Consubstantial;' some, as I conjecture, having originally objected to the word—others from habit—others, aware that the resistance was unsuitable, leaned to this side or that to gratify parties; and many thought it weak to waste themselves in such strife of words, and peaceably held to the Nicene decision." Hist. iii. 13.

CHAP. IV. born of the Holy Virgin, and crucified and dead and buried, and rose again from the dead the third day, and was taken up into heaven, and sat down on the right hand of the Father, and is coming at the end of the world, to judge quick and dead, and to render to every one according to his works; whose Kingdom ceases not, but endures unto the infinite ages; for He shall sit on the right hand of the Father, not only in this age, but also in that which is to come.

"And in the Holy Ghost, that is, the Paraclete; whom having promised to the Apostles to send forth after His ascension into heaven, to teach and to remind them of all things, He did send; through whom also are sanctified the souls of those who sincerely believe in Him.

"(1.) But those who say that the Son was from nothing, or from other subsistence and not from God, and that there was time or age when He was not, the Holy and Catholic Church regards as aliens.

"(2.) Again we say, Whosoever says that the Father and the Son are two Gods, be he anathema.[9]

"(3.) And whosoever, saying that Christ is God, before ages Son of God, does not confess that He subserved the Father for the framing of the universe, be he anathema.[1]

[9] This Anathema, which has occurred in substance in the Macrostich, and again infr. Anath. 18 and 23, is a disclaimer on the part of the Eusebian party of the charge with reason brought against them by the Catholics, of their in fact holding a supreme and a secondary God. In the Macrostich it is disclaimed upon a simple Arian basis. The Semi-arians were more open to this imputation; Eusebius distinctly calling our Lord a second and another God, vid. Append. *Eusebius*. It will be observed that this Anathema contradicts the one which immediately follows, and the 11th, in which Christ is called God; except on the one hand the Father and Son are one God, which was the Catholic doctrine, or, on the other, the Son is God in name only, which was the pure Arian or Anomœan.

[1] Vid. *Ministration*.

"(4.) Whosoever presumes to say that the Ingenerate, or a part of Him, was born of Mary, be he anathema. ED. BEN. § 27.

"(5.) Whosoever says that according to foreknowledge the Son is before Mary, and not that, generated from the Father before ages, He was with God, and that through Him all things were brought into being, be he anathema.

"(6.) Whosoever shall pretend that the substance of God was enlarged or contracted, be he anathema.

"(7.) Whosoever shall say that the substance of God being enlarged made the Son, or shall name the enlargement of His substance the Son, be he anathema.

"(8.) Whosoever calls the Son of God the mental or pronounced Word,[2] be he anathema.

"(9.) Whosoever says that the Son from Mary is man only, be he anathema.

"(10.) Whosoever, speaking of Him who is from Mary God and man, thereby means God the Ingenerate,[3] be he anathema.

"(11.) Whosoever shall understand judaically as a denial of the Only-begotten, before ages God, the words *I am the First and I am the Last and besides Me there is no God*, which are said for the denial of idols and of gods that are not, be he anathema.[4]

"(12.) Whosoever, because it is said *The Word was made flesh*, shall consider that the Word was changed into flesh, or shall say that He underwent an alteration in taking flesh, be he anathema.[4]

[2] Vid. *ἐνδιάθετος*.

[3] Vid. *ἀγέννητον*.

[4] The 12th and 13th Anathemas are intended to meet the charge which is referred to infr. p. 116, note [2], vid. Append. *Sabellius*, that Arianism involved the doctrine that our Lord's divine nature suffered. Athanasius brings this accusation against them distinctly in his work against Apollinaris, "Idle then is the fiction of the Arians, who suppose that the Saviour took flesh only, impiously imputing the notion of suffering to the impassible godhead." Contr. Appollin. i. 15, vid. also Ambros. de Fide, iii. 31. Salig in his de Eutychianismo ante Eutychen takes notice of none of the passages in the text.

CHAP. IV. "(13.) Whosoever, as hearing the Only-begotten Son of God was crucified, shall say that His Godhead underwent corruption, or passion, or alteration, or diminution, or destruction, be he anathema.

"(14.) Whosoever shall say that *Let Us make man* was not said by the Father to the Son, but by God to Himself, be he anathema.[5]

"(15.) Whosoever shall say that Abraham saw, not the Son, but the Ingenerate God or part of Him, be he anathema.

"(16.) Whosoever shall say that with Jacob, not the Son as man, but the Ingenerate God or part of Him, did wrestle, be he anathema.

"(17.) Whosoever shall explain, *The Lord rained fire from the Lord*, not of the Father and the Son, and says that He rained from Himself, be he anathema. For the Son who is Lord rained from the Father who is Lord.

"(18.) Whosoever hearing that the Father is Lord and the Son Lord and the Father and Son Lord, for there is Lord from Lord, says there are two Gods, be he anathema. For we do not rank the Son with the Father, but we consider Him as subordinate to the Father; for He did not descend upon Sodom without the Father's will, nor did He rain from Himself, but from the Lord, that is, the Father authorising it. Nor is He of Himself set down on the right hand, but He hears the Father saying, *Sit Thou on My right hand.*

"(19.) Whosoever says that the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost are one Person, be he anathema.

[5] This anathema is directed against the Sabellians, especially Marcellus, who held the very opinion which it denounces, that the Almighty God spake with Himself. Euseb. Eccles. Theol. ii. 15. The Jews said that Almighty God spoke to the Angels. Basil. Hexaem. fin. Others that the plural was used as authorities on earth use it in way of dignity. Theod. in Gen. 19. Vid. App. *Ministration.*

"(20.) Whosoever, speaking of the Holy Ghost as Paraclete, shall speak of the Ingenerate God, —— be he anathema. Ed. Ben. § 27.

"(21.) Whosoever shall deny, what the Lord taught us, that the Paraclete is other than the Son, for He hath said, *And another Paraclete shall the Father send to you whom I will ask*, be he anathema.

"(22.) Whosoever shall say that the Holy Ghost is part of the Father or of the Son, be he anathema.

"(23.) Whosoever shall say that the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost be three Gods, be he anathema.

"(24.) Whosoever shall say that the Son of God at the will of God came into being, as one of the things made, be he anathema.

"(25.) Whosoever shall say that the Son was generated, the Father not willing [6] it, be he anathema. For not by compulsion, forced by physical necessity, did the Father, as unwilling, generate the Son, but He both willed, and, after generating Him from Himself apart from time and any affection, manifested Him.

"(26.) Whosoever shall say that the Son is ingenerate and unoriginate, as if speaking of two unoriginate and two ingenerate, and making two Gods, be he anathema. For the Son is the Head, that is, the origin of all: and God is the Head, that is, the origin of Christ; for thus to one unoriginate origin of the universe do we religiously refer all things through the Son.

"(27.) And in accurate delineation of the idea of Christianity we say this again: Whosoever shall not confess that Christ is God, Son of God, and before ages, and that He subserved the Father in the framing of the Universe, but shall say that from the time that He was born of Mary, from thence He was called Christ and Son, and took an origin of being God, be he anathema."

[6] Vid. infr. Disc. ch. 9, p. 193, &c.

CHAP. IV. 33. Casting aside the whole of this, as if they had discovered something better, they propound another Faith, and write at Sirmium in Latin what is here translated into Greek.[7]

Seventh Confession, at Sirmium, (second Sirmian).

"Whereas it has seemed good that there should be some consideration concerning faith, all points have been carefully investigated and discussed at Sirmium in the presence of Valens, and Ursacius, and Germinius, and the rest.

"It is held for certain that there is one God, the Father Almighty, as also is preached in all the world.

"And His one Only-begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ, generated from Him before the ages; and that we may not speak of two Gods, since the Lord Himself has said, *I go to My Father and your Father, and My God and your God.* On this account He is God of all, as also the Apostle has taught: *Is He God of the Jews only, is He not also of the Gentiles? yes of the Gentiles also: since there is one God who shall justify the circumcision from faith, and the uncircumcision through faith;* and everything else agrees and has no ambiguity.

"But since many persons are disturbed by questions concerning what is called in Latin 'Substantia,' but in Greek 'Usia,' that is, to make it understood more exactly, as to 'Consubstantial,' or what is called, 'Like

[7] The Creed which follows was not put forth by a Council, but at a meeting of a few Arian Bishops, and the author was Potamius, Bishop of Lisbon. It is important as marking the open separation of the Eusebians or Acacians from the Semi-arians, and their adoption of Anomœan tenets. Hilary, who defends the Eusebian Councils up to this date, calls this a "blasphemia," and upon it followed the Semi-arian Council by way of protest at Ancyra. St. Hilary tells us that it was the Confession which Hosius was imprisoned and tortured into signing. There is no proof that it is the one which Pope Liberius signed; but according to Athanasius, he signed an Arian Confession about this time.

in substance,'[8] there ought to be no mention of any of these at all, nor exposition of them in the Church, for this reason and for this consideration, that in divine Scripture nothing is written about them, and that they are above men's knowledge and above men's understanding; and because no one can declare the Son's generation, as it is written, *Who shall declare His generation?* for it is plain that the Father only knows how He generated the Son, and again the Son how He has been generated by the Father. And to none can it be a question that the Father is greater: for no one can doubt that the Father is greater in honour and dignity and Godhead, and in the very name of the Father, the Son Himself testifying, *The Father that sent Me is greater than I.* And no one is ignorant that it is a Catholic doctrine, that there are two Persons[9] of Father and Son, and that the Father is greater, and the Son subordinated to the Father together with all things which the Father subordinated to the Son, and that the Father has no origin, and is invisible, and immortal, and impassible; but that the Son has been generated from the Father, God from God, Light from Light, and that His generation, as aforesaid, no one knows, but the Father only. And that the Son Himself and our Lord and God, took flesh, that is, a body, that is, from Mary the Virgin, as the Angel heralded beforehand; and as all the Scriptures teach, and especially the Apostle himself, the doctor of the Gentiles, Christ took manhood[1] of Mary the Virgin, through which He suffered. And the whole faith is summed up, and secured in this, that a Triad should ever be preserved, as we read in the Gospel, *Go ye and baptise all the nations in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.* And entire and perfect is the number of the Triad; but the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, sent forth

Ed. Ben. § 28.

[8] ὁμοούσιον and ὁμοιούσιον.
[9] πρόσωπα.
[1] ἄνθρωπον.

CHAP IV. through the Son came according to the promise, that He might teach and sanctify the Apostles and all believers." [2]

34. After drawing up this, and then becoming dissatisfied, they composed the faith which to their shame they paraded with "the Consulate." And, as is their wont, condemning this also, they caused Martinian the notary to seize it from the parties who had the copies of it.[3] And having got the Emperor Constantius to put forth an edict against it, they form another dogma afresh, and with the addition of certain expressions, after their way, they write thus in Isauria.

Ninth Confession, at Seleucia (*vid. supr. p.* 71).

We refuse not to publish the authentic Faith published

[2] It will be observed that this Confession; 1. by denying "two Gods," and declaring that the One God is the God of Christ, implies that our Lord is not God. 2. It says that the word "substance," and its compounds, ought not to be used, as being unscriptural, mysterious, and leading to disturbance; 3. it holds that the Father is greater than the Son "in honour, dignity, and Godhead;" 4. that the Son is subordinate to the Father, *together with* all other things; 5. that it is the Father's characteristic to be invisible and impassible. On the last head, vid. supr. p. 111, note [4], and *Sabellius*. They also say that our Lord, hominem suscepisse per quem *compassus* est, a word which Phœbadius condemns in his remarks in this Confession. It may be observed also that Phœbadius at the same time uses the word "spiritus" in the sense of Hilary and the Ante-Nicene Fathers, in a connection which at once explains the obscure words of the supposititious Sardican Confession, and turns them into another evidence of this additional heresy involved in Arianism. "Impassibilis Deus," says Phœbadius, "quia Deus *Spiritus* . . . non ergo passibilis Dei Spiritus, licet in homine suo passus." That is, the nature of a soul is *passibilis*, and therefore the Divine Word, which is *impassibilis*, cannot take the place of a soul in the Person of Emmanuel. Now the Sardican Confession is thought ignorant, as well as unauthoritative (e.g. by Natalis. Alex. Sæc. 4, Diss. 29), because it imputes to Valens and Ursacius the following belief, which he supposes to be Patripassianism, but which exactly answers to this aspect and representation of Arianism: ὅτι ὁ λόγος καὶ ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἐσταυρώθη καὶ ἐσφάγη καὶ ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἀνέστη. Theod. Hist. ii. 6, p. 844.

[3] Some critics suppose that the transaction really belongs to the second instead of the third Confession of Sirmium. Socrates connects it with the second. Hist. ii. 30. Vid. supr., pp. 70, 71.

at the Dedication at Antioch;[4] though certainly our Fathers at the time met together for a particular subject under investigation. But since One-in-substance, and Like-in-substance, have troubled many persons in times past and up to this day, and since moreover some are said recently to have devised the Son's Unlikeness to the Father, on their account we reject "One-in-substance" and "Like-in-substance," as alien to the Scriptures, but "Unlike" we anathematise, and account all who profess it as aliens from the Church. But the "Likeness" of the Son to the Father, we distinctly confess according to the Apostle, who says of the Son, *Who is the Image of the Invisible God.* Ed. Ben. § 29.

And we confess and believe in one God, the Father Almighty, the maker of heaven and earth, of all things visible and invisible.

And we believe also in our Lord Jesus Christ, His Son, generated from Him impassibly before all the ages, God the Word, God from God, Only-begotten, Light, Life, Truth, Wisdom, Power, through whom all things were made, in the heavens and on the earth, whether visible or invisible. He, as we believe, at the end of the world, for the abolition of sin, took flesh of the Holy Virgin, and was made man, and suffered for our sins, and rose again, and was taken up into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, and is coming again in glory, to judge quick and dead.

[4] The Semi-arian majority in the Council had just before been confirming the Creed of the Dedication; hence this beginning, vid. supr. p. 77, note [7]. They had first of all offered to the Council the third Sirmian, or "Confession with a Date," supr. p. 71, which their coadjutors offered at Ariminum, Soz. iv. 22, and at the end of the present they profess that the two are substantially the same. They seem to mean that they are both Homœan or Scriptural Creeds; they differ in that the latter, as if to propitiate the Semi-arian majority, adds an anathema upon Anomœan as well as on the Homoüsion and Homœusion.

CHAP. IV. We believe also in the Holy Ghost, which our Saviour and Lord named Paraclete, having promised to send Him to the disciples after His own departure, as He did send; through whom He sanctifieth all in the Church who believe and are baptised in the name of Father and Son and Holy Ghost.

But those who preach aught besides this Faith the Catholic Church regards as aliens. And that this faith is the equivalent of that which was published lately at Sirmium, under sanction of his religiousness the Emperor, is plain to all who read it.

35. Having written thus in Isauria, they went up to Constantinople,[5] and there, as if dissatisfied, they changed it, as is their wont, and, with certain additions against

[5] These two sections seem to have been inserted by Athan. after his letter was finished, and contain later occurrences in the history of Ariminum than were contemplated when he wrote supr. ch. ii. 15, 16, vid. note [7], p. 77. In this place Athan. distinctly says, that the following Confession, which the Acacians from Seleucia adopted at Constantinople, was transmitted to Ariminum, and there forced upon the assembled Fathers. This is not inconsistent with what seems to be the fact, that the Confession was drawn up at a Council held at Nice in Thrace near Adrianople in Oct., 359, whither the deputies from Ariminum had been summoned by Constantius, vid. Hilar. Fragm. viii. 5. There the deputies signed it, and thence they took it back to Ariminum. In the beginning of the following year 360 it was confirmed by a Council at Constantinople, after the termination of that of Ariminum, and to this confirmation Athanasius refers. Socrates says, Hist. ii. 37 fin., that they chose Nice in order to deceive the ignorant with the notion that it was Nicæa, and their creed the Nicene faith, and the place is actually called Nicæa, in the Acts of Ariminum preserved by Hilary, p. 1346. Such a measure, whether or not adopted in matter of fact, might easily have had success, considering the existing state of the West. St. Hilary de Syn. 91, and ad Const. ii. 7, had not heard the Nicene Creed till he came into Asia Minor, A.D. 356, and he says of his Gallic and British brethren "O blessed ye in the Lord and glorious, who hold the perfect and apostolic faith in the profession of your conscience, and up to this time know not creeds in writing," de Syn. 63. It should be added that at this Council Ulphilas the Apostle of the Goths, who had hitherto followed the Council of Nicæa, conformed, and thus

using even "Subsistence" of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, they transmitted it to the Council at Ariminum, and compelled even the Bishops in those parts to subscribe it, and those who contradicted them they got banished by Constantius. And it runs thus :— Ed. Ben. § 29—30.

Tenth Confession at Nice and Constantinople.

"We believe in One God the Father Almighty, from whom are all things;

"And in the Only-begotten Son of God, begotten from God before all ages, and before all origin, through whom all things were made, visible and invisible, and begotten as Only-begotten, only from the Father only,[6] God from God, like to the Father that begat Him according to the Scriptures; whose generation no one knows, except the Father alone who begat Him. He, as we acknowledge, the Only-begotten Son of God, the Father sending Him, came hither from the heavens, as it is written, for the undoing of sin and death, and was born from the Holy Ghost, of Mary the Virgin according to the flesh, as it is written, and lived with His disciples, and having fulfilled the whole economy according to the Father's will, was

became the means of spreading through his countrymen the Creed of Ariminum.

[6] *μόνος ἐκ μόνου.* Though this is an Homœan or Acacian, not an Anomœan Creed, this phrase may be considered a symptom of Anomœan influence; *μόνος παρὰ*, or *ὑπὸ, μόνου* being one special formula adopted by Eunomius, explanatory of *μονογενής*, in accordance with the original Arian theory, mentioned de Decr. n. 12, supra, p. 20, that the Son was the one instrument of creation. Eunomius said that He alone was created by the Father alone; all other things being created by the Father, not alone, but *through* Him whom alone He had first created, vid. Cyril. Thesaur. 25, p. 239. St. Basil observes that if this be a true sense of *μονογενής*, then no man is such, e.g. Isaac, as being born of two, contr. Eunom. ii. 21. Acacius has recourse to Gnosticism, and illustrates the Arian sense by the contrast of the *προβολὴ* of the Æons, which was *ἐκ πολλῶν*, ap. Epiph. Hær. 72, 7, p. 839.

CHAP. IV. crucified and dead and buried and descended to the parts below the earth; at whom hell itself shuddered: who also rose from the dead on the third day, and remained with the disciples, and, forty days being fulfilled, was taken up into the heavens, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, to come in the last day of the resurrection in the Father's glory, that He may render to every man according to his works.

"And in the Holy Ghost, whom the Only-begotten Son of God Himself, Christ, our Lord and God, promised to send to the race of man, as Paraclete, as it is written, the Spirit of Truth, which He sent unto them when He had ascended into the heavens.

"But the name of 'Substance,' which was set down by the Fathers in simplicity, and being unknown by the people, caused offence, because the Scriptures contain it not, it has seemed good to take away, and for the future to make no mention of it at all; since the divine Scriptures have made no mention of the Substance of Father and Son. For neither ought Subsistence to be named concerning Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. But we say that the Son is Like-the-Father, as the divine Scriptures say and teach; and all the heresies, both those which have been afore condemned already, and whatever are of modern date, being contrary to this published statement, be they anathema." [7]

[7] Here as before, instead of speaking of Arianism, the Confession anathematises *all* heresies vid. supr. p. 98, note [3]. It will be observed that for "Like in all things," which was contained in the Confession (third Sirmian) first submitted to the Ariminian Fathers, is substituted simply "Like." Moreover, they include hypostasis or subsistence, though a Scripture term, in the list of proscribed symbols, vid. also ad Afros. 4. The object of suppressing *ὑπόστασις*, seems to have been that, since the Creed, which was written in Latin, was to go to Ariminum, the West might be forced to deny the Latin version or equivalent of *ὁμοούσιον*, unius substantiæ, or hypostasis, as well as the Greek original. This circumstance might be added to those in the Translator's "Tracts

36. However, they did not stand even to this; for coming down from Constantinople to Antioch, they were dissatisfied that they had written at all that the Son was "Like-the-Father, as the Scriptures say;" and putting their ideas upon paper, they set about reverting to their first doctrines, and said that the Son is altogether Unlike-the-Father, and that the Son is in no manner Like-the-Father, and so much did they change, as to admit those who spoke the Arian doctrine nakedly, and to make over to them the Churches, with licence to bring forward the words of blasphemy with impunity.[8] Because then of the extreme shamelessness of their blasphemy they were called Anomœans by all, having also the name of Exucontian,[9] and the heretical Constantius for the patron of their impiety, who persisting up to the end in impiety, and on the point of death,[1] thought good to be

Theol." pp. 78, &c., to show that in the Nicene formulary *substance* and *subsistence* are synonymous.

[8] Acacius, Eudoxius, and the rest, after ratifying at Constantinople the Creed framed at Nice and subscribed at Ariminum, appear next at Antioch a year and a half later, when they throw off the mask, and avowing the Anomœan Creed, "revert," as St. Athanasius says, "to their first doctrines," i.e. those with which Arius started. The Anomœan doctrine, it may be observed, is directly opposed rather to the Homœusian than to the Homoüsion, as indeed the very symbols show; "unlike in substance," being the contrary to "like in substance." It doubtless frightened the Semi-arians, and hastened their return to the Catholic doctrine.

[9] From ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων. "out of nothing," one of the original Arian positions concerning the Son, supr. Enc. p. 4, note [1], Theodoret says, that they were also called Exacionitæ, from the name of their place of meeting, Hær. iv. 3, and Du Cange confirms it so far as to show that there was a place or quarter of Constantinople called Exocionium or Exacionium.

[1] Nothing is more instructive in the whole of this eventful history than the complication of hopefulness and deterioration in the Oriental party, and the apparent decline yet advance of the truth. Principles, good and bad, were developing on both sides with energy. The fall of Hosius and Liberius, and the disastrous event of Ariminum, are close before the ruin of the Eusebian power. At this critical moment Constantius died, when the cause

CHAP. IV. baptised; not however by religious men, but by Euzoius, who for his Arianism had been deposed, not once, but often, both when he was a deacon, and when he was in the see of Antioch.

37. The forementioned parties then had proceeded thus far, when they were stopped and deposed. But well I know, not even under these circumstances will they stop, as many have already played the hypocrite,[2] but they will always be making parties against the truth, until[3] they return to themselves and say, "Let us rise and go to our fathers, and say unto them, We anathematise the Arian heresy, and we acknowledge the Nicene Council;" for against this is their quarrel. Who then, with ever so little understanding, will bear them any longer? who on witnessing in every Council some things taken away and others added, does not comprehend the deep and festering treachery of their hearts in regard of Christ? who on seeing them stretching out to so great a length both their

of truth was only not in the lowest state of degradation, because a party was in authority and vigour who could reduce it to a lower still; the Latins committed to an Anti-Catholic Creed, the Pope deluded, Hosius fallen and dead; Athanasius wandering in the deserts, Arians in the sees of Christendom, and their doctrine growing in blasphemy, and their profession of it in boldness, every day. The Emperor had come to the throne almost when a boy, and at this time was but 44 years old. In the ordinary course of things he might have reigned till, humanly speaking, orthodoxy was extinct. This passage shows that Athanasius did not insert these sections till two years after the composition of the work itself; for Constantius died A.D. 361.

[2] Vid. *Hypocrisy*.

[3] He is here anticipating the return into the Church of those whom he thus censures. In this sense, though with far more severity in its language, the writer of a Tract, imputed to Athan. against the Catholicising Semi-arians of 363, entitles it "On the *hypocrisy* of Meletius and Eusebius of Samosata." It is remarkable that what Athan. here predicts was fulfilled to the letter, even of the worst of these "hypocrites." For Acacius himself, who in 361 signed the Anomœan Confession above recorded, was one of those very men who accepted the Homoüsion with an explanation in 363.

professions of faith, and their own exculpation, but sees that they are giving sentence against themselves,[4] and studiously making professions of faith, which by an officious display and an abundance of words are likely to seduce the simple, and hide what they really are in point of heresy? But as the heathen, as the Lord said, using vain words in their prayers, are nothing profited, so they too, after all their words were spent, have failed to annul the general condemnation of the Arian heresy, but were convicted and deposed instead,—and rightly; for which of their formularies is to be accepted by the hearer? or with what confidence shall they undertake to be catechists to those who have recourse to them? for if all these creeds have one and the same meaning, what is the need of many? But if need has arisen of so many, it follows that each by itself is deficient, not complete; and they establish this point against themselves with more effect than we can, by their innovating on all their own documents and re-making them.[5] And the number of their Councils, and the discordance of their statements, is a proof that those who were present at them had much hostility to the Nicene Council, but little strength against Nicene Truth.

Ed. Ben. § 32.

Chapter V.[6]

38. But since they are thus minded both towards each other

[4] Vid. supr. note [2], p. 15.

[5] Considering that Athanasius had now been for several years among the monasteries of the deserts, in close concealment (unless we suppose he really had issued thence and was present at Seleucia), this is a remarkable instance of accurate knowledge of the state of feeling in the heretical party, and of foresight. From his apparent want of knowledge of the Anomœans, and his unhesitatingly classing them with the Arians, his foresight would seem in a great measure to arise from intimate comprehension of the doctrine itself in dispute, and of its bearings. There had been at that time no parallel of a great aberration and its issue.

[6] The subject of chapters v. and vi. naturally rises out of what has gone before. Athan. has

CHAP. V. and towards their predecessors, let us ask them at once and ascertain what extravagance they have seen, or what phrases they complain of, that they should thus disobey their fathers, and contend against an Ecumenical Council? They will answer, "The phrases 'Of the substance' and 'Consubstantial' do not please us, for they are a scandal to some and a trouble to many."[7] This is what they have said in writing; and the reply is obvious. If really there was aught in these phrases of a nature to scandalise or trouble, not merely some would be scandalised and many troubled, but all men, we and every one else, would feel the effect of them. But there has been nothing of the kind; on the contrary, I can affirm that these phrases content all men; no common men were the original authors of them; Bishops gathered together from all parts of the world adopted them, and just now above 400 at Ariminum are furnishing an additional testimony to their excellence. Does not this plainly prove against them that not the Nicene Fathers are in fault, but the perverseness of those who misinterpret them? How many there are

traced out the course of Arianism to what seemed to be its result, the resolution of it into a better element or a worse,—the precipitation of what was really unbelieving in it into its Anomœan form, and the gradual purification of that Semi-arianism which prevailed in the Eastern Sees, vid. supr. p. 91, note [2]. The Anomœan creed was hopeless; but with the Semi-arians all that remained was the adjustment of phrases. They had to reconcile their minds to terms which the Church had taken from philosophy and adopted as her own. Accordingly, Athan. goes on to propose such *explanations* as might clear the way for a re-union of Christendom. What remains of his work then is chiefly devoted to the consideration of the "Consubstantial" or "one-in-substance" (as contrasted with "Like-in-substance") which had confessedly great difficulties in it.

[7] This is only stating what the above Confessions have said again and again. The objections made to it were: 1. that it was not in Scripture; 2. that it had been disowned by the Antiochene Council against Paul of Samosata; 3. that it was of a material nature, and belonged to the Manichees; 4. that it was of a Sabellian tendency; 5. that it implied that the divine substance was distinct from God.

who misunderstand Scripture, and in consequence quarrel with its holy authors!—as the Jews of old, who rejected our Lord, or the Manichees now, who blaspheme the Law,—yet without Scripture being in fault, but its evil-minded critics.[8] If then you can point out what is wrong in these phrases, do so by all means; let us see your proof; but drop the pretence of offence created by them, lest you come into the condition of the Pharisees of old, to whom, on their pretending offence at the Lord's teaching, He answered, *Every plant, which My Heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up.* By which He showed that, not the words of the Father as planted by Him were really an offence to them, but that they misinterpreted good words and were their own stumbling block. And in like manner they who at that time blamed the Epistles of the Apostle, impeached not Paul, but their own deficient learning and distorted minds. Ed. Ben. § 33—55.

39. For answer me, what is much to the purpose, Who are they whom you pretend to be scandalised and troubled at these terms? those who are religious towards Christ? not one; they on the contrary make much of these terms and maintain them. But if they are Arians who thus feel, what wonder they should be distressed at words which destroy their heresy? for it is not the terms which are a scandal to them, but the placarding of their impiety which is their trouble. Therefore let us have no more murmuring against the Fathers, nor any pretence of this kind; or you will be making complaints next of the Lord's Cross, that it is *to Jews an offence and to Gentiles foolishness*, as said the Apostle. But as the Cross is not faulty, for to us who believe it is Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God, though Jews rave, so neither are the terms of the Fathers faulty, but profitable to those who rightly read, and subversive of all impiety, though the Arians so often burst

[8] Vid. infr. Disc. ch. 3, init.

CHAP. V. with rage as being by them condemned. The plea of scandal then will not stand: especially since you yourselves have distinctly written, "From the Father is generated the Son?" I ask then of you, when you speak of "the Father," as being "God," do you mean the divine Substance, "Essence," "Being," "*Qui est*"? or do you view Him apart from, short of, not to say inferior to Him, I mean, to His substance? If the latter, which I do not like to suppose, you should not have pronounced the Son to be from the Father, but from what invests the Father or belongs to Him, and then you would have avoided saying that God is in any true sense a Father by making Him composite and material,[1] that is, by starting a new blasphemy with a view of a "Son," who is not a substance, but only a name, (for such He will be to you,) and by thus substituting for things which *are*, imaginations which *are not*.

40. Nor is this all. If God, when viewed as Father, be not identical with the Divine Being or Substance, then I am led to ask, whether He be such when viewed as Creator? Do you not open the door to Greek atheism, to a creation by chance or by atoms? What is the Divine Substance but that One Being who both generates and creates? Hence in Scripture we read, "God is *I am*," "God creates," "God is one," "God is a Father," "God is almighty," without discriminating between Father and Creator. Both are predicated of One and the Same; both imply acts of Him, acts of that simple and blessed and incomprehensible Reality or Substance which is He; and, if you have gone only just so far as to confess that the Son is "from God," you have really, with the Nicene

[1] Vid. supr. pp. 40, 41, and App. *περιβολή*. If God the Supreme Being is not identical with the Divine Essence or Substance, then the idea of Him resolves itself into what modern astronomy would call a *nebula*.

Fathers, confessed that He is from God's substance. Perhaps you will ask us, "If this be so plain, if it be all the same to speak of the Divine Being or Substance as to speak absolutely of God, why are you not satisfied with 'from God'? why do you insist on 'from the Substance'"? For this reason: because "from God" bears two senses. Thus, when we speak of God as a Creator, we say that all things are "*from* Him;" and so again, the Son is "*from* Him," but not as a creation; for as a Creator, God brings all things out of nothing, but, as a Father, He has brought the Son out of Himself, and He gives His whole Being to His Word, or Son, without ceasing to be what He is. Ed. Ben. § 33—55.

41. The Council, then, comprehending this, and aware of the different senses of the phrase, that none should suppose that the Son was said to be from God as the creation is, wrote with greater explicitness that the Son was "from the substance."[2] For this determines the genuine relation of the Son towards the Father; whereas, in its being said simply "from God," only the will of the Creator concerning the framing of all things is signified. If then these critics meant distinctly "offspring," when they wrote that the Word was "from the Father," they had nothing to complain of in the Council's decision; but if, on the contrary, by "from God," they meant, in the instance of the Word, what it means as used of the creation, then they should not call the Word "Son," or they will be mingling what is blasphemous with what is pious with a manifest inconsistency. For if He is a Son, He is not a creature; but if a creature, then not a Son. Since these are their notions, perhaps they will be denying Holy Baptism, because it is administered into Father and Son; and not into Creator and creature, as they account Him.

[2] Supr. pp. 37—41

CHAP. V. 42. "But," they say, "this is not written, and we reject these words as unscriptural." But this, again, in their mouths, is an audacious argument. For if they think everything must be rejected which is not written, wherefore, when the Arian party invent such a heap of phrases, not from Scripture, such as "Out of nothing," and "the Son was not before His generation," and "Once He was not," and "He is alterable," and "the Father is ineffable and invisible to the Son," and "the Son knows not even His own Substance," and all that Arius has vomited in his absurd and impious Thalia, why do not they speak against these, but rather battle for them; and on that account are at war with their own Fathers? And, in what place of Scripture did they on their part find "Ingenerate," and the very name of "substance," and "there are three subsistences," and "Christ is not very God," and "He is one of the hundred sheep," and "God's Wisdom is ingenerate and unoriginate, but the created powers are many, of which Christ is one"? Or how, when at the so-called Dedication, the party of Acacius and Eusebius used expressions not in Scripture, and said that "the First-born of the creation" was "the exact Image" of the divine substance, and power, and will of God, how can they complain of the Fathers, for introducing unscriptural expressions, and especially "substance"? For they ought either to complain of themselves, or to find no fault with the Fathers.

43. Now, if certain others made the Council's phrases their excuse, it might perhaps have been set down either to ignorance or to reverence. There is no question, for instance, about George of Cappadocia,[3] who was expelled from Alexandria,—a man, without character in years past, nor a Christian in any respect; but only pretending to

[3] Vid. *Arian leaders.*

the name to suit the times, and thinking *religion is a trade.* And therefore reason is there none for complaining of his making mistakes about the faith, considering he *knows neither what he says nor whereof he affirms;* but, according to the text, *as a bird maketh haste to the snare.* But when Acacius and Eudoxius, and Patrophilus say this, do not they deserve extreme reprobation? for while they use words which are not in Scripture themselves, and have accepted many times the term "substance" as suitable, especially on the ground of the letter of Eusebius, they now blame their predecessors for using terms of the same kind. Nay, though they say themselves, that the Son is "God from God," and "Living Word," "exact Image of the Father's substance," they accuse the Nicene Bishops of saying, that He who was begotten is "of the substance of Him who begat Him," and "consubstantial" with Him. But what marvel is this conflict with their predecessors and own Fathers, when they are inconsistent with themselves, and fall foul of each other? For after publishing, at the Dedication so-called at Antioch, that the Son is "exact Image" of the Father's substance, and swearing that so they held, and anathematising those who held otherwise, nay, in Isauria, writing down, "We do not decline the authentic faith published at the Dedication at Antioch," where the term "substance" was introduced, still, shortly after, in the same Isauria, as if forgetting all this, they put into writing the very contrary, saying, "We reject the words 'Consubstantial' and 'Like-in-substance,' as alien to the Scriptures, and put away from us 'substance,' as not contained therein."

Ed. Ben. § 33—55.

44. What sort of faith then have they who stand neither to their word nor writing, but alter and change everything according to the season? For if, O Acacius and Eudoxius, you "do not decline the faith published at the Dedication,"

CHAP. V

and in it is written that the Son is "exact[4] Image of substance," why is it ye write in Isauria, "We reject 'the Like-in-substance'"? for if the Son is not like the Father in respect of substance, how is He "exact Image of the substance"? But if you are dissatisfied at having written "exact Image of the substance," how is it that ye "anathematise those who say that the Son is Unlike"? for if He be not according to substance like, He is altogether unlike: and the Unlike cannot be an Image. And if so, then it does not hold that *he that hath seen* the Son, *hath seen the Father*, there being then the greatest difference possible between Them, or rather the One being wholly Unlike the Other. And Unlike cannot possibly be called Like.[5] By what artifice then do ye call Unlike like, and consider Like to be unlike, and thus are hypocrites enough to say that the Son is the Father's Image? for if the Son be not like the Father in substance, something is wanting to the Image, and it is not a complete Image, nor a perfect Radiance. How then read ye, *In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily?* and, *from His fulness have all we received?* How is it that ye expel the Arian Aetius[6] as a heretic, though ye say the same with him? for thy companion is he, O Acacius, and he became Eudoxius's master to the extreme of such impiety; which was the reason why Leontius the Bishop made him deacon, that using the name of the diaconate as a sheep's clothing, he might be able with impunity to vomit forth the words of blasphemy. What then has persuaded you to contradict each other, and to earn for yourselves so great a disgrace? You cannot give any good account of it; this supposition only

[4] Vid. ἀπαράλλακτος.

[5] Hence the Anomœans (whose symbol was the Unlike) were directly opposed, not to the orthodox Homoüsians, but to the Homœans and Homœusians, the Acacians and Semi-arians.

[6] Vid. *Arian leaders.*

remains, that all you do is but outward profession and pretence, in order to secure the countenance of Constantius and the gain from thence accruing. And ye make nothing of accusing the Fathers, and ye complain outright of their language as being unscriptural; and, as it is written, have *prostituted yourselves to everyone that passed by;* so as to change as often as they wish, in whose pay and keep you are.

45. Yet, though a man use terms not in Scripture, this is no serious matter, provided that his meaning is right.[7] But, on the other hand, the heretic, even though he use scriptural terms, yet as being not the less an object of suspicion and unsound within, shall be asked by the Spirit, *Why dost thou preach My laws, and takest My covenant in thy mouth?* Thus, whereas the devil, though speaking from the Scriptures, was silenced by the Saviour, the blessed Paul, though he speaks even from profane writers, *The Cretans are always liars*, and, *For we are His offspring*, and, *Evil communications corrupt good manners*, yet, having a religious meaning, as being himself holy, he is *doctor of the nations, in faith and verity*, as having *the mind of Christ*, and what he speaks comes to us with a religious sound. But what is there to approve in the Arian terms, in which the *caterpillar* and the *locust* are put before the Saviour, and He is reviled with "Once Thou wast not," and "Thou wast created," and "Thou art foreign to God in

[7] Vid. supr. p. 36. And so S. Gregory in a well-known passage: "Why art thou such a slave to the letter, and takest up with Jewish wisdom, and pursuest syllables to the loss of things? For if thou wert to say 'twice five,' or 'twice seven,' and I concluded 'ten' or 'fourteen' from your words, or from 'a reasonable mortal animal' I concluded 'man,' should I seem to you absurd? how so, if I did but give your meaning? for words belong as much to him who demands them as to him who utters." Orat. 31, 24. Vid. also Hil. contr. Constant. 16 August. Ep. 238, n. 4—6. Cyril. Dial. i. p. 301. Petavius refers to other passages, de Trin. iv. 5, § 6.

CHAP. V. substance," and, in a word, no insult is spared against Him? On the other hand, what good word have the Fathers of the Council omitted? yea, rather have they not a lofty view and a Christ-loving piety? And yet these Acacians have written down, "We reject their words;" at the same time that they endure the insults of the Arians towards the Lord, and make it clear to all men that for no other cause do they resist that Great Council than because it condemned the Arian heresy. For it is on this account again that they misinterpret and are hostile to the term Consubstantial. If their faith was orthodox, and they confessed the Father as truly Father, and believed the Son to be genuine Son, and by nature true Word and Wisdom of the Father, and if, in saying that the Son is *from God*, they applied those words to Him, not in the sense in which they use them of themselves, but understood Him to be the proper Offspring of the Father's substance, as the radiance is from light, they would not any one of them have found fault with the Nicene Fathers, but would have been confident that the Council wrote suitably; and that this is the orthodox faith concerning our Lord Jesus Christ.

46. "But," say they, "the sense of such expressions is obscure to us;" for this is another of their pretences. "We reject them," say they, "because we cannot master their meaning." But if they were true in this profession, instead of saying, "We reject them," they should ask instruction from those who know; else ought they to reject whatever they cannot understand in divine Scripture, and to find fault with the writers. But this would be the crime of heretics rather than of us Christians; for what we do not understand in the sacred oracles, instead of rejecting, we inquire about from persons to whom the Lord has revealed it, and from them we ask for instruction. However, if they would make this pretence of obscurity avail, let them at least confess what is annexed

to the Creed, and anathematise those who hold that "the Son is from nothing," and "He was not before His generation;" also that "the Word of God is a creature and work," and "He is alterable by nature," and "from another subsistence;" and in a word let them anathematise the Arian heresy, which has originated such impiety. Nor let them say any more, "We reject the terms," but that "we do not yet understand them;" if they must find some reason for declining them. But well know I, and am sure, and they know it too, that if they could disavow these propositions and anathematise the Arian heresy, they would have no difficulty about those terms of the Council. For on this account it was that the Fathers, after declaring that the Son was begotten from the Father's substance, and consubstantial with Him, thereupon added, "But those who say 'The Son is from nothing,' &c., &c., and so on, we anathematise;" on this account, I mean, in order to show that the statements are parallel to each other, and that the terms in the Creed imply the disclaimers subjoined, and that all who confess the terms, will certainly understand the disclaimers. But those who both dissent from the anathemas and impugn the definition, such men are proved on every side to be foes of Christ. Ed. Ben. § 33—55.

Chapter VI.

47. Those who deny the Council altogether, are sufficiently exposed by these brief remarks; but there are men to whom the above does not quite apply, I mean men who would not shrink from the anathema, though they have difficulties about the definition. To speak frankly then, those who accept everything else that

CHAP. VI. was settled at Nicæa, and quarrel only about the "Consubstantial," must not be regarded as enemies; nor do we here attack them as Ario-maniacs, nor as opponents of the Synodal Fathers, but we discuss the matter with them as brothers with brothers, who mean what we mean, and dispute only about the word. For, confessing that the Son is from the substance of the Father, and not from other subsistence, and that He is not a creature nor work, but His genuine and natural offspring, and that He is eternally with the Father, as being His Word and Wisdom, they are not very far from accepting even the phrase "One in substance;" of whom is Basil [8] of Ancyra, in what he has written concerning the faith. For only to say "Like-according-to-substance," does not quite express "Of the substance," by which phrase rather, as they have themselves allowed, the genuine relation of the Son to the Father is signified. Thus tin is only "like" to silver, an elm to a beech, and gilt brass to the true metal; but tin is not "from" silver, nor could an elm be accounted the seedling of a beech.[9] But since they say that He is "Of-the-substance" and "Like-in-substance," what do they signify by these but "One-in-substance"?[1] For, while to say only "Like-in-substance" does not necessarily convey "Of-the-substance," on the contrary, to say "One-in-substance," or "Consubstantial," is to signify the meaning of both terms, "Like-in-substance," and "Of-the-substance." And accordingly they themselves in controversy with those who maintain that the Word is not a

[8] Vid. *Arian leaders.*

[9] Vid. Hypoc. Mel. and Hilar. de Syn. § 89. The principle involved is this,—Things that are like, are not the same, and therefore ὁμοιούσιον is not ὁμοούσιον. Vid. *Semi-arianism.*

[1] Socr. iii. 25, *Una substantia* religiosè prædicabitur, quæ ex nativitatis proprietate, et ex naturæ similitudine, ita indifferens sit, ut una dicatur. Hil. de Syn. 67.

real Son, but a creature, have [2] before now taken their proofs against them from human illustrations of son and father, with this exception, that God is not as man, nor the generation of the Son as an offspring of man, but as an act which may befittingly be ascribed to God, and which it becomes us to imagine. Thus they have called the Father the Fount of Wisdom and Life, and the Son the Radiance of the Eternal Light, and the Offspring from the Fountain, as He says, *I am the Life*, and *I Wisdom dwell with Prudence.* But the Radiance from the Light, and Offspring from the Fountain, and Son from Father, how can these be so suitably expressed as by "Consubstantial"? ED. BEN. § 33—55.

48. I say, they themselves have dwelt upon the force of the word "Son" as applied to the Lord, as contained in its earthly sense: and yet these very men are afraid, on account of its earthly sense, of the word "consubstantial." But is there in truth any cause of fear, lest, because the offspring from men are consubstantial, the Son, by being called One-in-substance, should be Himself considered as a human offspring too? perish the thought! not so; but the explanation is easy. For the Son is the Father's Word and Wisdom; whence we are reminded of the impassibility and indivisibility of such a generation from the Father. For not even man's word is part of him, nor proceeds from him according to passion; much less God's Word, whom the Father has also declared to be His own Son, only lest, on the other hand, if we merely heard of the "Word," we should suppose Him, such as is the word

[2] Here at last Athan. alludes to the Ancyrene Synodal Letter, vid. Epiph. Hær. 37, 5 and 7, about which he has kept a pointed silence above, when tracing the course of the Arian confessions. That is, he treats the Semi-arians as tenderly as S. Hilary, sparing their personal delinquencies, till he can speak kindly of them. The Ancyrene Council of 358 was a protest against the "blasphemia," or second Sirmian Confession, which Hosius signed.

CHAP VI. of man, non-subsistent; but that, hearing that He is Son, we may acknowledge Him to be a living Word and a substantive Wisdom. Accordingly, as in saying "offspring," we have no human thoughts, and, though we know God to be a Father, we entertain no material ideas concerning Him, but while we listen to these illustrations and terms, we think suitably of God, for He is not as man, so in like manner, when we hear of "Consubstantial," we ought to transcend all sense, and, according to the Proverb, *understand by the understanding what is set before us;* so as to know that not by mere will, but in truth, is He genuine from the Father, as Life from Fountain, and Radiance from Light. Else, why should we understand "Offspring" and "Son" in a sense not corporeal, while we conceive of "Consubstantial" as after the manner of bodies? especially since these terms are not here used respectively about different subjects, but both of them, "Offspring" and "Consubstantial," about one and the same. And it is but consistent to attach the same sense to both expressions, when they are applied to the Saviour, and not to interpret "Offspring" as it should be, and "Consubstantial" as it should not; nay, if you are minded thus to act, then, in speaking of the Son as Word and Wisdom of the Father, you ought to take an opposite view of these two terms also, and understand in the one sense Word and in the other sense Wisdom. But as this would be extravagant, (for the Son is the Father's Word and Wisdom, and the Offspring from the Father is one and proper to His substance,) so the sense of "offspring" and "consubstantial" is one, and whoso considers the Son an offspring, rightly considers Him also as "consubstantial."

49. This is sufficient to show that the term "consubstantial" is not foreign nor far from the meaning of these much-loved persons. But their difficulty seems to them to have weight for another reason. They allege, (for I have

not myself the Epistle in question,) that the Bishops who condemned Samosatene[3] at Antioch have laid down in writing that the Son is not consubstantial with the Father; accordingly, from reverence and honour due to those Bishops at Antioch, they have not the best of dispositions towards the Nicene term. I think it well respectfully to offer some remarks on this important point. Certainly it is unbecoming to make the one assembly conflict with the other; for all of them are Fathers of the Church; nor is it religious to settle, that these have spoken well, and those ill; for all of them have gone to sleep in Christ. Nor is it right to be disputatious, and to compare the respective numbers of those who met in the Councils, lest the three hundred at Nicæa may seem to throw the lesser into the shade; nor on the other hand to compare the dates, lest those who preceded seem to eclipse those that came after. For all, I repeat, are Fathers; and, anyhow, the three hundred laid down as doctrine nothing new, nor was it in any self-confidence that they became champions of words not in Scripture, but they started from their Fathers, as the others did, and they used their Fathers' words. For there were two Bishops of the name of Dionysius, much older than the seventy who deposed Samosatene, of whom one was of Rome, and the other of Alexandria; and a charge had been laid by some persons against the Bishop of Alexandria, before the Bishop of Rome, as if he had said that the Son was made, and not consubstantial with the Father. This had given great pain to the members of the Roman Council; and the Bishop of Rome expressed their united sentiments in a letter to his

ED. BEN. § 33—55.

[3] There were three Councils held against Paul of Samosata, of the dates of 264, 269, and an intermediate year. The third is spoken of in the text, which, contrary to the opinion of Pagi, S. Basnage, and Tillemont, Pearson fixes at 265 or 266.

CHAP. VI. namesake. This led to the latter's writing an explanation which he calls the Book of Refutation and Apology; and his words run thus:—

The Bishop of Alexandria to the Bishop of Rome.

50. "And I have written in another Letter, a refutation of the false charge which they bring against me that I deny that Christ is consubstantial with God. For though I say that I have not found or read this term anywhere in holy Scripture, yet my remarks which follow, and which they have passed over, are not inconsistent with my holding it. For I instanced a human issue, which is evidently homogeneous, and I observed that undeniably fathers differed from their children only in not being identical as individuals; otherwise there could be neither parents nor children. And my Letter, as I said before, owing to present circumstances, I am unable to produce, or I would have sent you the very words I used, or rather a copy of it all; which, if I have an opportunity, I will do still. But I am sure from recollection, that I adduced many parallels of things kindred with each other, for instance, that a plant grown from seed or from root, was other than that from which it sprang, and yet altogether one in nature with it; and that a stream flowing from a fountain, changed its appearance and its name, for that neither the fountain was called stream, nor the stream fountain, yet both existed, and that the fountain was as it were father, and the stream was what was generated from the fountain."

51. Thus the Bishop. If then any one finds fault with the Fathers at Nicæa, as if they contradicted the decisions of their predecessors, he may reasonably find fault also with the seventy, because they did not keep to the statements of their own predecessors; for such were the two Dionysii and the Bishops assembled on that occasion at Rome. But neither these nor those is it religious to blame; for all were ambassadors of the things of Christ, and all used diligence against the heretics, and while the one party condemned Samosatene, the other condemned the Arian heresy. And rightly did both these and those

define and suitably to the matter in hand. And as the blessed Apostle, writing to the Romans, said, *The Law is spiritual, the Law is holy, and the commandment holy and just and good;* yet soon after, *What the Law could not do, in that it was weak*, and wrote to the Hebrews, *The Law made no one perfect;* and to the Galatians, *By the Law no one is justified;* yet to Timothy, *The Law is good if a man use it lawfully;* and no one would accuse the Saint of inconsistency and variation in writing, but rather would admire how suitably he wrote to each, in order to warn the Romans and the others to turn from the letter to the spirit, but to instruct the Hebrews and Galatians to place their hopes not in the Law, but in the Lord who gave the Law;—so, if the Fathers of the two Councils made different mention of the Consubstantial, we ought not in any respect to differ from them, but to investigate their meaning, and this will fully show us the concordant sentiment of both the Councils. For they who deposed Samosatene took Consubstantial in a bodily sense because Paul had attempted sophistry and said, "Unless Christ has of man become God, it follows that He is consubstantial with the Father; and if so, of necessity there are three substances, one the previous substance, and the other two from it;" and therefore guarding against this they said with good reason, that Christ was not consubstantial,[4] for the Son is not related to the Father as Paul imagined. But the Bishops who anathematised the Arian heresy,

Ed. Ben. § 33—55.

[4] This is in fact the objection which Arius urges against the One-in-substance, supr. p. 85, when he calls it the doctrine of Manichæus and Hieracas; Vid. Append. *Hieracas.* The same objection is protested against by St. Basil, contr. Eunom. i. 19, Hilar. de Trin. iv. 4. Yet, while S. Basil agrees with Athan. in his account of the reason of the Council's rejection of the word, St. Hilary on the contrary reports that Paul himself accepted it, *i.e.*, in a Sabellian sense, and therefore the Council rejected it. But vid. Append. *Homoüsion.*

CHAP. VI. understanding Paul's craft, and reflecting that the word "Consubstantial" has not this meaning when used of things immaterial, and especially of God, and acknowledging that the Word was not a creature, but an offspring from the substance, and that the Father's substance was the origin, and root, and fountain of the Son, and that He was of very truth His Father's Likeness, and not of different nature, as we are, and separate from the Father, but that as being from Him, He exists as Son indivisible, as Radiance is with respect of Light, and knowing too the illustration used in Dionysius's case, the "fountain," and the defence thereby of the word "Consubstantial," and before this the Saviour's saying, indicative of unity, *I and the Father are one*, and *He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father*, on these grounds they reasonably asserted on their part, that the Son was consubstantial. And as, according to a former remark, no one would blame the Apostle, if he wrote to the Romans about the Law in one way, and to the Hebrews in another; in like manner, neither would the present Bishops find fault with the former, in regard to their interpretation of the term, nor would the former blame those who came after them, on the score of their opposite interpretation and the call there was thus to speak of the Lord.

52. Yes surely, each Council had a sufficient reason for its own language; for since Samosatene held that the Son was not before Mary, but received from her the origin of His being, therefore the Fathers at Antioch deposed him and pronounced him heretic; but concerning the Son's Godhead, writing in simplicity, they were not perfectly accurate in their treatment of the term Consubstantial, but, as they understood it, so spoke they about it. For they directed all their thoughts to destroy the device of Samosatene, and to show that the Son was before all things, and that, instead of becoming God after having been a

man, God had put on a servant's form, and the Word had become flesh, as John says. This is how they dealt with the blasphemies of Paul; but when the party of Eusebius and Arius began to teach that, though the Son was before time, yet was He made and one of the creatures, and as to the phrase "from God," they did not believe it in the sense of His being genuine Son from Father, but maintained it as it is said of creatures and a Creator, and as to the oneness of likeness between Son and Father, they did not confess that the Son is like the Father according to substance, or according to nature, but because of His agreement with Him in doctrines and in teaching; nay, when they drew a line and made the Son's substance absolutely foreign from the Father, and degrading Him to the creatures, on this account the Bishops assembled at Nicæa, with a view to the craft of the parties so holding, and as bringing together the sense from the Scriptures, cleared up the point, by affirming the "Consubstantial;" that both the true genuineness of the Son might thereby be known, and that things which were made might have nothing ascribed to them in common with Him. For the preciseness of this phrase detects their pretence, whenever they would use "from God," and gets rid of all the subtleties with which they seduce the simple. For whereas they contrive to put a sophistical construction on all other words at their will, this phrase only, as detecting their heresy, do they dread, which the Fathers did set down as a bulwark against their impious speculations one and all. Ed. Ben. § 33—55.

53. And here the parallel case of the term "Ingenerate," as a title of the Supreme Being, supplies us with an illustration in point. This, too, is a word not found in Scripture, but taken from the philosophical schools, and, like "Consubstantial," has various senses. I understand that it is sometimes used for what exists without origin or cause; sometimes for uncreate. Now in the first of

CHAP. VI. these senses a man might rightly say that the Word is not ingenerate, only the Father, plainly because He is a Son; but in the second he might rightly say that He was ingenerate, because He was not a creature. And in consequence holy writers of times past seem to contradict each other by using it in these two senses respectively. For instance, Ignatius, who was appointed Bishop in Antioch after the Apostles, and became a martyr of Christ, writes concerning the Lord thus: "There is one physician, fleshly and spiritual, generate and ingenerate, God in man, true life in death, both from Mary and from God;"—here he says that the Lord is ingenerate, meaning that He is uncreate; but some teachers who follow Ignatius, write in their turn,[5] "One is the Ingenerate, the Father, and one the genuine Son from Him, true Offspring, Word and Wisdom of the Father," implying that the Son is not ingenerate, that is, because, in their sense, to be ingenerate is to be without Father as well as without Creator. If, therefore, we are unfavourably disposed towards these writers, then have we right to quarrel with the Councils; but if, knowing their faith in Christ, we are persuaded that the blessed Ignatius was orthodox in writing that Christ was generate on account of the flesh, (for He was made flesh,) yet ingenerate, because He is not in the number of things made and generated, but Son from Father, and are aware too that the parties who have said that the Ingenerate is One, meaning the Father, had no intention of pronouncing that the Word was generated

[5] The writer is not known. The President of Magdalen, Dr. Routh, has pointed out to the Translator the following similar passage in St. Clement: *ἓν μὲν τὸ ἀγέννητον, ὁ παντοκράτωρ θεὸς, ἓν δὲ καὶ τὸ προγεννηθὲν δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν.* Strom. vi. 7, p. 769.

and made, but that the Father has no cause, but rather is Himself Father of Wisdom, and in Wisdom hath made all things that have been brought into being, why do we not combine in one religious belief all our Fathers, those who deposed Samosatene as well as those who proscribed the Arian heresy, instead of making distinctions between them and refusing to entertain a right opinion of them? I repeat, that these, looking towards the sophistical explanation of Samosatene, wrote, "He is not consubstantial," and those, with an excellent meaning, said that He was. For myself, my respectful feeling towards those good Fathers at Antioch has led me in their behalf thus to write, however briefly; but could I come by the letter which they are alleged to have written, I consider we should find some further grounds for the aforesaid proceeding of those sainted men. For it is right and meet thus to feel, and to maintain a good understanding with our Fathers, if we be not spurious children, but have received our tradition from them, and our lessons of religion at their hands. Such then being, as we believe and maintain, the sense of the Fathers at Antioch, let us proceed, as with them before us, to inquire once again, calmly and with a good intent, whether the Bishops congregated at Nicæa did not also really exercise an excellent judgment upon it. ED. BEN. § 33—55.

54. For consider; it was their duty to protect the cardinal truth that our Lord was really the Son of God, which a deadly heresy had denied. How were they to exclude the evasions to which the Arians had recourse? They proceeded thus: a son, they said, is an offspring, but, in order to be such, he must spring from that of which he is the offspring; nor does he so spring, unless he is from what that original *is*,—that is, in other words, from its *substance*, as the derivation of

CHAP. VI. the word "substance" shows.† Thus, to be the Son of God, if He is God's offspring or true Son, is to be "of" or "one with" God's substance,—that is, to be "consubstantial" with Him. Such was the conclusion of the Fathers at Nicæa; they determined that consubstantiality was bound up with the idea of Sonship, that nothing short of this word adequately expressed their doctrine of the Son's relation to the Father, and that it was a denial of any true Sonship to deny the consubstantiality. Such is the force of *I and the Father are One*, and *He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father*. What can they mean, but the Son is One with the One God? As to oneness of teaching, oneness of sentiment and affection, or participation of the Divine fulness, both saints and, still more, angels and archangels, have such unity with God. If this were enough, each of them might say, "I and the Father are One." But, if such a thought be monstrous, as it truly is, nothing is left but to conceive Son's and Father's Oneness in the way of substance. He says, *All things that the Father hath are Mine*, and *All Mine are Thine and Thine are Mine*. Thus, as being the exact *Image of the Father*, as some of you confess, He has all divine attributes, (except indeed as being Father,) and is His Father's equal.

55. This is a thought to enlarge upon. There are those, I say, who allow that the Son is the Image of the Father, yet will not allow that He is One with the Father. See how plainly Scripture speaks about that likeness, for it will lead us to an important conclusion. For instance, the name God; for *the Word was God*;—Almighty, *Thus saith He that is, and that was, and that is to come, the Almighty*;—the being Light,

† οὐσία, οὖσα, ὁμοούσιος.

I am, He says, *the Light*;—the Creative Cause, *All things were made by Him*, and, *Whatsoever I see the Father do I do also*;—His Eternity, *His eternal power and Godhead*, and, *In the beginning was the Word*, and, *He was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world*;—His being Lord, for, *The Lord rained fire and brimstone from the Lord*, and while the Father says, *I am the Lord*, and, *Thus saith the Lord, the Almighty God*, of the Son Paul speaks thus, *One Lord Jesus Christ, through whom all things*. And to the Father Angels minister, and again too the Son is worshipped by them, *And let all the Angels of God worship Him*; and He is said to be Lord of the Angels, for, *the Angels ministered unto Him*, and *the Son of Man shall send His Angels*. The being honoured as the Father, for *that they may honour the Son*, He says, *as they honour the Father*;—being equal to God, *He thought it not robbery to be equal with God*;—the being Truth from the True, and Life from the Living, as being truly from the Fountain of the Father;—the quickening and raising the dead as the Father, for so we read in the Gospel. And of the Father it is written, *The Lord thy God is One Lord*, and *the God of gods, the Lord, hath spoken, and hath called the earth*; and of the Son, *The Lord God hath shined upon us*, and, *The God of gods shall be seen in Sion*. And again of God, Esaias says, *Who is a God like unto thee, taking away iniquities and passing over unrighteousness?* and thus the Son said to whom He would, *Thy sins be forgiven thee*; for instance, when on the Jews murmuring, He manifested that remission by His act, saying to the paralytic, *Rise, take up thy bed and go unto thy house*. And of God Paul says, *To the King eternal*; and again of the Son, David in the Psalm, *Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of glory shall come in*. And Daniel heard it said, *His Kingdom is an everlasting Kingdom, and*

ED. BEN. § 33—55.

CHAP. VI. *His Kingdom shall not be destroyed.* And in a word, all that you find said of the Father, so much will you find said of the Son, all but His being Father, as has been said.

56. Can then, a man in his senses fancy that this equality in attributes comes from any origin but the Father Himself? Surely it is but a reasonable inference that no substance other than the Father's admits of such attributes, and that all that is the Father's is the Son's, because the Son, as being such, is the very Reflection of the Father, His Image and Figure. How can He have the Father's attributes without having that substance to which those attributes belong? Let us take reverential heed, lest transferring what is proper to the Father to some being unlike Him in substance, we introduce another substance foreign to Him, yet capable of the properties of Him, the first substance, though He Himself silences the thought in His own words, *My glory I will not give to another.* The Father and Son, therefore, are One in substance, and the term "consubstantiality" is the safeguard and token of this unity. We shall be professing two Gods, unless we hold that, by the divine generation, the substance in the Father is made over to the Son. The Son is equal to the Father, simply because He is one with Him.

57. Here we see the contrast between the "One-in-substance" of Father and Son and the mere participation[1] in the Divine Fulness which, in various measures, is given to His creatures. The Son is the Father's Word and Wisdom, and thereby His illuminating and deifying power,—not alien, but one in substance with Him, for by partaking of Him we partake of the Father to whom He belongs. Wherefore, if He, too, Himself were from participation and not from the Father, His substantial

[1] Vid. App. *μετουσια.*

Godhead and Image, He could not deify, as needing deification Himself. For, as to one who possesses only from participation, even what he has is not his own, but the giver's, and what he has received is barely the grace sufficient for himself. ED. BEN. §33–55.

58. You tell me of an objection urged by some against the "One-in-substance," to the effect that to speak of one substance implies three, one pre-existing, and then those are not Father and Son, but two brothers. But this is a Greek explication, and what Greeks say have no claim upon us; or rather let me say that these matters are above the human intellect. God gave birth from His own substance to His Son; but He also created all things out of nothing. Is creation comprehensible? We must not measure divine actions by earthly experience. Even what is earthly we do not understand, much less do we understand heavenly. We must beware of giving a corporeal sense to the Divine substance and to its communication to the Son, when we ought to recede from things generate, and, casting away human images, nay, all things sensible, to ascend to the Father, lest, in our ignorance we rob Him of the Son, and rank the Son among His own creatures.

59. If, then, not two substances, nor three, are implied in our holding a Father and a Son; if we maintain that the Father in generating a Son from Himself is simply beyond our intellect, as when He creates out of nothing, there is no fear of our holding, with Marcion or Valentinus, two Gods and two Origins, independent, alien, and unlike each other. But, if we acknowledge that the Father's Godhead is one and sole, and that of Him the Son is the Word and Wisdom, and that thereby the likeness between Them consists, not as the heretics say in the likeness merely of Their teaching, but in truth of substance, as the Light is one and the Radiance one, yet they are not two,

CHAP. VI. how do we not follow the holy Prophets who say, *The Word of the Lord came to me*, yet still, as recognising the Father who was beheld and revealed in Him were bold to say, "*The God of our Fathers hath appeared to me.*" This being so, if He be the illuminating and creative Power, specially proper to the Father, without whom He neither frames nor is known, why should we decline the phrase expressing it? Why do we not pronounce the Son, Homoüsion, One-in-substance with the Father?

60. When we urge this, we are met by the persons I have in view with the word "Homoœsion," or "Like-in-substance," as if preferable to One-in-substance." But do not they see that the mention of "Like" implies the existence of at least two substances? And, if the two are like, they are equal; and this implies in the case before us two Gods. "Like-in-substance" is then not an advisable word, when we would be exact. Nor is this all; strictly speaking, we cannot use the word "like" of substances, but only of the fashion or the quality of a thing. Thus two men compared together are not of like nature but of the same nature; whereas when we speak of their being like each other, we mean in character, or attributes, or circumstances. On the other hand we should not say that a man is unlike a dog, but other than a dog. And as qualities are participated in more or less by different subjects, likeness is a matter of degree, but there are no degrees of sameness and of identity. Thus whereas God is all perfect, but we imperfect, in consequence St. John says, "When He shall be made manifest, we shall be *like* Him." It is not enough then, if the Word is God, to say with you that He is "Like-in-substance" to the Father, for that is only to be more or less divine, but He is One-in-substance or Consubstantial. I repeat, in speaking of Like-in-substance, we mean like

by participation ; and this is proper to creatures, for they, by partaking, are made like to God. *When He shall appear, we shall be like Him ;* that is, we shall be like the Son in our degree ; not in substance but in sonship, which we shall partake from Him. If then you speak of the Son Himself as being merely by participation, then indeed call Him Like-in-substance ; but thus spoken of, He is not "Truth," nor "Light" at all, nor in nature God. But He is, not merely by participation, but in nature and truth, Son, Light, Wisdom, God ; and being all this by nature, not by sharing, therefore He is properly called, not Like-in-substance, but One-in-substance. This justifies the Nicene Fathers in having laid down, what it was becoming to express, that the Son, begotten from the Father's substance, is One-in-substance or Consubstantial with Him. And if we have been taught as those Bishops were, let us not fight with shadows, especially as knowing that they who have so defined have made this confession of faith, not to misrepresent the truth, but as vindicating it and piety towards Christ, and further as destroying the blasphemies against Him of the Ario-maniacs. For this must be considered and noted carefully, that, in using Unlike-in-substance, and Other-in-substance, we signify not the true Son, but some one of the creatures, and a supposititious and adopted Son, which pleases the heretics ; but when we speak uncontroversially of the One-in-substance, we signify a genuine Son born of the Father ; though at this Christ's enemies often burst with rage. ED. BEN. § 33—55.

61. What then I have learned myself, and have heard men of judgment say in their discussions, I have written in few words ; but ye, remaining on the foundation of the Apostles, and holding fast the traditions of the Fathers, pray that now at length all strife and rivalry may cease, and the futile questions of the heretics may be condemned,

CHAP VI. and all logomachy; and the guilty and murderous heresy of the Arians may disappear, and the Truth may shine again in the hearts of all, so that all everywhere may say the same thing, and think the same thing; and that no Arian contumelies remaining, there may be said and confessed in every Church, *One Lord, one faith, one baptism*, in Christ Jesus our Lord, through whom to the Father be the glory and the strength, unto ages of ages. Amen.

POSTSCRIPT.

After I had written my account of the Councils, I had information that that most impious Constantius had sent Letters to the Bishops staying in Ariminum; and I took pains to get copies of them from true brethren, and to send them to you, and also what the Bishops answered; that you may know the impious unscrupulousness of the Emperor, and the Bishops' firm and unswerving hold of the Truth.

Translation of his Letter.[6]

"Constantius, conquering and triumphant, Augustus, to all Bishops who are assembled at Ariminum.

"That the divine and adorable Law is our chief care, your Excellencies are not the men to be ignorant; but as yet we have been unable to receive the twenty Bishops sent

[6] These two Letters are in Socr. ii. 37. And the latter in Theod. Hist. ii. 15, in a different version from the Latin.

by your wisdom, and charged with the legation from you, as being pressed by a necessary expedition against the barbarians; and, as you know, it beseems to have the soul clear from every care, when one handles the matters of the Divine Law. Therefore we have ordered the Bishops to await at Adrianople our return, that, when all public affairs are well arranged, then at length we may hear and weigh their suggestions. Let it not then be grievous to your patience to await their return, that, when they come back with our answer to you, you may be able to bring matters to a close which so deeply affect the well-being of the Catholic Church." ED. BEN. § 33—55.

This was what the Bishops received at the hands of three messengers.

Copy of the Bishops' Reply.

"The Letter of your humanity we have received, most religious Lord Emperor, stating that, on account of stress of public affairs, as yet you have been unable to see our legates, and bidding us to await their return, until your piety shall be advised by them of what we have defined conformably to our ancestors. However, we now profess and aver at once by these presents, that we shall not recede from our purpose, as we also instructed our legates. We claim then that you will with serene countenance command these letters of our mediocrity to be read before you; as well as that you will favourably receive those with which we charge our legates. This, however, in your graciousness you comprehend as well as we, that great grief and sadness at present prevails, from the circumstance that, in these your most happy days, so many Churches are without their Bishops. And next, we request of your humanity, most religious Lord Emperor, that if it

CHAP. VI. please your piety, you would bid us, before the severe winter weather sets in, to return to our Churches, that so we may be able to offer with our people to the Omnipotent God and to our Lord and Saviour Christ, His Only-begotten Son, the full measure of our wonted prayers, in behalf of your imperial sway, as indeed we have ever made them, and as we make them at this present."

THREE DISCOURSES OF ATHANASIUS AGAINST ARIANISM.

PREFATORY NOTICE.

THE following Three Discourses against Arianism, the greatest work of their Author, are written on a definite plan, though not without some want of method and order in the execution. They consist mainly of a doctrinal comment, both controversial and didactic, upon cardinal passages of Scripture, which the Arians urged as inconsistent with the Catholic dogma of our Lord's proper divinity. Twelve texts, or groups of texts, are examined in this aspect and their real meaning determined, nine of them giving occasion for enlarging on His Divine Nature and His Economical Office, and three on the circumstances and results of His Incarnation.

To this extended comment, which is the rich staple of the work, is prefixed a series of answers to certain elementary formulæ and *à priori* assumptions of Arianism, such as have been more or less already dealt with in the two preceding Epistles, and which moreover, from their close connexion with each other and the heresy itself, naturally present themselves once more in various places of the exposition of Scripture passages, as in the three chapters introductory of the comment on Prov. viii. 22. Such imperfection in logical arrangement was, in so large a subject and in the instance of a writer with so little leisure, unavoidable: a more noticeable blemish is the dislocation of the chapter answering the Arian question, whether the *gennesis* was an act of the Divine Will; which, instead of

forming one of the subjects of the introductory argumentation, prior to the comments on texts of Scripture, has been thrown to the end of the work, as if a Postscript or Appendix, very much as the chapter on the "Ingenerate" occurs in the *de Decretis*, supr. p. 49. I have ventured in this Translation to transpose this chapter to what seems its more natural place. Vid. infr. pp. 191—204.

In cutting off the so-called fourth Oration or Discourse from the Three which precede it in Montfaucon's Edition, as if not belonging to Athanasius's work against Arianism, I am exercising the same liberty as the learned Benedictine himself takes as regards these Discourses, in reducing Photius's Five, or *Pentabiblus*, to Four by cutting off the first of them. My reasons are given in "Theological Tracts," Dissert. i.

As I have mentioned Photius's name, it may be well to cite here the judgment of that great literary authority on St. Athanasius's Pentabiblus, of which these Three Discourses form the substance.

"In his writings Athanasius is ever perspicuous, never wordy, never involved. He is keen, deep, nervous in his mode of arguing, and marvellously fertile. His argumentation has nothing poor or puerile in it (as happens in the case of the young or half-educated), but is philosophical and magnificent, full of thought and with broad views, fortified by testimonies of Scripture and weighty proofs. Especially such is he in his treatises 'against the Greeks,' and 'on the Incarnation;' and in his Pentabiblus against Arius, which is a triumphant defeat of every heresy, and eminently of Arianism. And if we were to say that Gregory Theologus and the divine Basil, as if drawing from a well, derived from this Treatise their beautiful and luminous arguments against the heresy, I consider we should not be far from the mark."

THREE DISCOURSES OF ATHANASIUS,

&c.

Chapter I.

1. All heresies have in them an element of mad impiety, which, when at length they have *gone out from us*, is recognised by all, as it was of old time. Indeed, the very fact of that departure is in itself an evidence, as blessed John has written, that, whatever be their doctrine, it does not breathe nor has breathed a Christian spirit. Hence our Saviour says, that they who gather not with us, scatter with the Evil One, and then, while men are slumbering, watch their opportunity for sowing the field of the Church with poisonous seed, that in death they may have companions. One heresy, however, there is, the latest that has gone from us, the Arian, as it is called, which, in its craft and unscrupulousness, is a very forerunner of Antichrist. This heresy, in order to avoid the proscription which is the sure destiny of the whole family of error, affects, like its father in our Lord's Temptation, to array itself in the words of Scripture.[1] By this contrivance it is forcing its way into paradise, and has seduced certain souls to think bitter sweet, and to take and eat, with Eve in the beginning. And this is why I find it necessary, as you

Ed. Ben. Orat. i. 1.

[1] Vid. Append. *Scripture.*

CHAP. I. exhort me, now to undertake its refutation,[2] that they who are far from its influence, may continue firm in shunning it, and that those whom it has deceived may repent, abjuring their good opinion of it, and understanding that to call its adherents Christians, argues little knowledge whether of Scripture, or of Christianity and its faith.

2. For what resemblance to our holy faith have they discovered in it, to make them so wantonly maintain that its supporters propound nothing evil? This in truth is to call even Caiaphas a Christian, and to reckon the traitor Judas still among the Apostles, and to say that they who asked for Barabbas instead of the Saviour did no evil, and to maintain Hymenæus and Alexander as right-minded, and that the Apostle slandered them. But neither would a Christian bear to hear this, nor would he consider the man who dared to say it of sane mind. For with them in place of Christ is Arius, as with the Manichees Manichæus; and for Moses and the other saints they have made the discovery of one Sotades, a man whom even Gentiles laugh at, and of the daughter of Herodias. For of the one has Arius imitated the dissolute and effeminate tone, in the Thalias which he has written; and the other he has rivalled in her dance, reeling and frolicking in his blasphemies against the Saviour; till the victims of his heresy lose their wits and go foolish, and change the Name of the Lord of Glory into the likeness of the *image of corruptible man*, and for Christians come to be called Arians, bearing this badge of their impiety.

3. Let them not attempt to retort that on this score they are on a par with us, because, as we call them Arians, so

[2] In these Orations he scarcely makes mention of the Homoüsion, his object apparently being simply to show the momentous issue of the controversy itself, and the sophistries of the heretics. Vid. Append.

they in turn may name us from our teachers.[3] No, never at any time did Christian people take their title from the Bishops among them, but from the Lord, on whom we rest our faith. Thus, though the blessed Apostles have become our teachers, and have ministered the Saviour's Gospel, yet not from them have we our title, but from Christ we are and are named Christians. But for those who derive the faith which they profess from private persons, good reason is it such men should bear the name of those whose property they have become. Yes surely; while all of us are and are called Christians after Christ, Marcion broached a heresy time since and was cast out; and those who continued with the Bishop who ejected him remained Christians; but those who followed Marcion were called Christians no more, but henceforth Marcionites. Thus Valentinus also, and Basilides, and Manichæus, and Simon Magus, have imparted their own name to their followers; and are accosted as Valentinians, or as Basilidians, or as Manichees, or as Simonians; and others, Cataphrygians from Phrygia, and from Novatus Novatians. So too Meletius, when ejected by Peter the Bishop and Martyr, called his party no longer Christians but Meletians;[4] and so in consequence when Alexander of blessed memory had cast out Arius, those who remained with Alexander remained Christians; but those who went out with Arius left the Saviour's name to us who were with Alexander, and as to them they were henceforward denominated Arians. ED. BEN. i. § 1—2.

4. Behold then, after Alexander's death too, those who communicate with his successor Athanasius, and those with whom the said Athanasius communicates, are instances of the same rule; none of them bear his

[3] On the attempt, continual but fruitless, to affix some name short of "Catholic" or "Christian" on the children of the Church, vid. *Essay on Dev. Doctr.* p. 254, and App. *Catholic.*

[4] Vid. *Meletius.*

CHAP. I. name, nor is he named from them, but all in like manner, and as is usual, are called Christians. For though we have a succession of teachers and become their disciples, still, because we are taught by them the things of Christ, we both are, and are called, Christians all the same. But those who follow the heretics, though they have innumerable successors in their heresy, yet for certain bear the name of him who devised it. Thus, though Arius be dead, and many of his party have succeeded him, yet those who think with him, as being known from Arius, are called Arians. And, it is a remarkable evidence of this, that those of the Greeks who even at this time come into the Church, on giving up the superstition of idols, take the name, not of their catechists, but of the Saviour, and are henceforth for Greeks called Christians; while those of them who go off to the heretics, and, again, all who from the Church change to this heresy, abandon Christ's name, and at once are called Arians, as no longer holding Christ's faith, but having become heirs of the mania of Arius.

5. How then can they be Christians, who for Christians are Ario-maniacs? or how are they of the Catholic Church, who have shaken off the Apostolical faith, and become authors of what is new and evil? who, after abandoning the oracles of divine Scripture, call Arius's Thalias a new wisdom? and with reason too, for a novelty that wisdom is. And hence a man may marvel that, whereas many have written many treatises and abundant homilies upon the Old Testament and the New, yet in none of them is a Thalia found; nay nor among the more respectable of the Greeks, but among those only who sing such strains over their cups, amid cheers and jokes, when men are merry, that the rest may laugh; till this marvellous Arius, who, taking no grave pattern, and ignorant even of what is respectable, while he stole largely from other heresies, would in the

ludicrous go nothing short of Sotades.[5] For what beseemed him more, when he would dance forth against the Saviour, than to throw his impious words into dissolute and abandoned metres? that, while *a man*, as Wisdom says, *is known from the utterance of his word*, so from those numbers should be seen the writer's effeminate soul and corruption of thought. So much for his style of writing; now let us inquire into the matter of which it is the expression. ED. BEN. i. § 3—5.

CHAPTER II.

6. THUS he starts:—

"According to faith of God's elect, God's prudent ones,
Holy children, rightly dividing, God's Holy Spirit receiving,
Have I learned this from the partakers of wisdom,
Accomplished, divinely taught, and wise in all things.
Along their track have I been walking, with like opinions,
I the very famous, the much suffering for God's glory;
And taught of God, I have acquired wisdom and knowledge."

Then follow his blasphemies:—"God was not always a Father;" but "once God was alone and not yet a Father, but afterwards He became a Father." "The Son was not always;" for, whereas all things were made out of nothing, and all things are creatures and works, so the Word of God Himself "was made out of nothing," and "once was not," and "was not before His generation," but as others "had an origin of creation." "For God," he says, "was alone, and the Word as yet was not, nor the Wisdom. Then, wishing to frame us, thereupon He

[5] Vid. Append. *Arius*.

CHAP. II. made a certain being, and named Him Word and Wisdom and Son, that He might form us by means of Him." Accordingly he says that there are two Wisdoms, first, the attribute co-existent with God, and next, that by this Wisdom the Son was generated, and was only named Wisdom and Word as partaking of it. "For Wisdom," saith he, "at the will of the wise God, had its existence by Wisdom." In like manner, he says, that there is another Word in God besides the Son, and that the Son again, as partaking of it, is named Word and Son according to grace. And this too is an idea proper to their heresy, as shown in other works of theirs, that there are many powers, one of which is God's own by nature and eternal; but that Christ, again, is not the true power of God: but, as others, one of the so-called powers; one of which, namely, the locust and the caterpillar, is called in Scripture, not merely the power but the *great power*. The others are many and are like the Son, and of them David speaks in the Psalms, when he says *the Lord of Hosts* or *powers*. And by nature, as all beings, so the Word Himself is alterable, and remains good by His own free will, while He chooseth; when, however, He wills, He can alter as we can, as being of an alterable nature. For "therefore," saith he, "as foreknowing that He would be good, did God by anticipation bestow on Him this glory, which afterwarks, as man, He attained from virtue. Thus in consequence of His works foreknown, did God bring it to pass that He, being such, should come into being."

7. Moreover he has dared to say, that "the Word is not the true God;" that "though He is called God He is not very God," but "by participation of grace, He, as all the others, is God only in name." And, whereas all beings are unlike and foreign to God in substance, so too is "the Word unlike and alien in all things to the Father's substance and essence," and belongs to things

created, and is one of these. Afterwards, he says that "even to the Son the Father is invisible," and "the Word cannot perfectly and exactly either see or know His own Father;" but even what He knows and what He sees, He knows and sees "in proportion to His own measure," as we also know according to our own capacity. For the Son, too, he says, not only knows not the Father exactly, for He fails in comprehension, but "He knows not even His own substance;"—and that "the substances of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are separate in nature, and apart, and disconnected, and alien, and without participation of each other;" and, in his own words, "utterly unlike to each other in substance and glory, infinitely so." Thus as to "likeness of glory and substance," he says that the Word is entirely foreign to both the Father and the Holy Ghost. In such words hath the impious spoken; declaring that the Son is distinct by Himself, and in no respect partaker of the Father.

Ed. Ben. i. § 5—7.

8. Who can hear all this without losing self-command? *The heaven*, as the Prophet says, *was astonished, and the earth shuddered* at the transgression of the Law. But the sun, with greater horror once, impatient of the bodily contumelies which the common Lord of us all voluntarily encountered for us, turned away, and, withdrawing his rays, made that day sunless. And shall not all human kind at Arius's blasphemies be struck speechless, and stop their ears, and shut their eyes, to escape hearing them or seeing their author? Rather, will not the Lord Himself have reason to denounce the unthankfulness, as well as the impiety, of such men, in the words which He hath already uttered by the Prophet Hosea? *Woe unto them, for they have fled from Me; destruction upon them because they have transgressed against Me; though I have redeemed them yet they have spoken lies against Me.*

CHAP. III. And soon after, *They imagine mischief against Me; they turn away to a nothing.* For to turn away from the Word of God, which is, and to fashion to themselves one that is not, is to fall to what is nothing. For this was why the Ecumenical Council, when Arius thus spoke, cast him from the Church, and anathematised him, as impatient of such impiety.[6] And ever since has Arius's error been reckoned for a heresy more than ordinary, he being known as Christ's foe, and forerunner of Antichrist. Though then so great a condemnation of this impious teaching be sufficient in a special way to make all men flee from it, as I said above, yet since certain persons called Christian, either in ignorance or in pretence, think it an indifferent matter in relation to the Truth, and call its professors Christians, proceed we to put some questions to them, according to our powers, thereby to expose its unscrupulous character. Perhaps, when thus encountered, they will be silenced, and flee from it, as from the sight of a serpent.[7]

CHAPTER III.

The Son of God uncreate and from everlasting.

9. If then they consider that the use of certain phrases of divine Scripture changes the blasphemy of the Thalia into praise and blessing, then of course they ought simply to disown Christ with the present Jews, when they see how those Jews study the Law and the Prophets; perhaps too they will deny the Law and the Prophets like Manichees, considering the latter read some portions of the Gospels. But what is the use of appealing to the Scriptures, if it is an

[6] Vid. Append. *Arius.*

[7] "Etiamsi in erroris eorum destructionem nulli conderentur libri, hoc ipsum solum, quod hæretici sunt pronunciati, orthodoxorum securitati sufficeret." Vig. contr. Eutych. i. p. 494.

imperfect appeal? To believe in one doctrine avails not, if you deny the rest. Arius then has lost his all of faith, and betrays his ignorance of our whole creed, and does but play the hypocrite when he denounces other heresies. For how can he speak truth concerning the Father, who denies the Son that reveals Him to us? or how can he be orthodox concerning the Spirit, while he speaks profanely of the Word from whom is Its supply? and who will trust his teaching concerning the Resurrection, denying, as he does, Christ, for our sakes the First-begotten from the dead? and how shall he not err in respect to His incarnate presence also, who is simply ignorant of the Son's genuine and true generation from the Father? For thus, the old Jews also, denying the Word, and saying, *We have no king but Cæsar*, were forthwith stripped of all they had, and forfeited the light of the Lamp, the fragrance of ointment, the knowledge of prophecy, and the Truth itself; till now they understand nothing, but are walking as in darkness. ED. BEN. I. § 8.

10. A great darkness surely this heresy! for who was ever yet a hearer of such a doctrine? or whence or from whom did its abettors and hirelings[9] gain it? who thus expounded to them when they were at school? who told them, "Abandon creature-worship and then draw near and worship a creature and a work"?[1] But if they themselves own that now for the first time they have heard it, let them not deny that this heresy is foreign to Christians, and not from our fathers? But what is not from our fathers, but has been lighted on in this day, how can it be but that of which the blessed Paul has foretold, that *in the latter times some shall depart from the sound faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, in the hypocrisy of liars, cauterized in their own conscience, and turning away from the truth?*[2]

[9] Vid. Append. *Arians.*
[1] Vid. *Semi-arians.*
[2] Vid. supr. p. 7, Enc. n. 5, and App. *Alexander.*

CHAP. III.

11. For, behold, we take Divine Scripture, and out of it discourse with freedom concerning the holy Faith, and set it up as a light upon its candlestick, and say:—"He is true Son of the Father, natural and genuine, and proper to His substance, Wisdom Only-begotten, True and only Word of God, not a creature, nor a work, but an Offspring proper to the Father's substance. And therefore it is that He is True God, because from the True Father He exists consubstantially. As to other beings, to whom He has said, *I said ye are gods*, only by participation of the Word through the Spirit have they this grace; but He is the *Impress* of the Father's *Person*,[3] and *Light* from *Light*, and *Power*, and true *Image* of the Father's substance. For this too the Lord has said, *He that hath seen Me, hath seen the Father.* And He ever was and is, and never was not. For the Father being everlasting, His Word and His Wisdom must be everlasting also;" such is our holy faith, but those champions of Arius, what have they to show us from the infamous Thalia? What but this? that "God was not always a Father, but became so afterwards; the Son was not always, for He was not before His generation; He is not from the Father, but He, as others, has come into subsistence out of nothing; He is not proper to the Father's substance, for He is a creature and work"? And "Christ is not true God, but He, as others, was made God by participation; the Son has not exact knowledge of the Father, nor does the Word see the Father perfectly; and neither exactly understands nor knows the Father. He is not the true and only Word of the Father, but is in name only called Word and Wisdom, and is called by grace Son and Power. He is not unalterable, as the Father is, but alterable in nature, as the creatures, and He comes short of perfect knowledge of the Father reaching to comprehension."

[3] ὑπόστασις.

12. Wonderful this heresy, not plausible even, but making speculations against Him that is, that He be not, and everywhere putting forward blasphemy for blessing! Were any one, after inquiring into both sides, to be asked, whether of the two he would follow in faith, or whether of the two spoke fitly of God,—nay, if these fosterers of impiety themselves be asked, what ought they to answer? For this is the cardinal question, Was He, or was He not? ever, or not before His generation? without beginning, or from this and from them? true Son, or by adoption and from participation and as a conception? Is it right to call Him one of God's works, or to unite Him to the Father; to consider Him unlike the Father in substance, or like and proper to Him; a creature, or Him through whom the creatures came to be? shall we say that He is the Father's Word, or that there is another Word beside Him, and that by this other He was made, and by another Wisdom; and that He is only named Wisdom and Word, and is a partaker of this Wisdom, and second to it? Ed. Ben. i. § 9—10.

13. Which of these theologies, I say, in its language concerning the Lord Jesus, is consonant with Scripture?[4] and, if there is only one answer to be made, why do you not make it? For there is no middle path, and they know this well; but in their craft, I say, they conceal it, not having the courage to speak out, but uttering something else. For should they speak, a condemnation would follow; and should they be suspected, proofs from Scripture will be cast at them from every side. Wherefore, in their craft, as children of this world, after feeding their so-called lamp from the wild olive, and fearing lest

[4] Athan., it may be said, always assumes the traditional or ecclesiastical truth (which the Arians granted) "Christ is God," and then he goes at once to Scripture to illustrate and explain it. Which explanation, he asks, ours or the Arian, best accords with Scripture?

CHAP. III. it should soon be quenched (for it is said, *the light of the wicked shall be put out*), they hide it under the bushel of their hypocrisy, and make a different profession, and boast of patronage of friends and authority of Constantius, that what with their hypocrisy and their boasts, those who come to them may be kept from seeing how foul their heresy is.

14. Is it not detestable, again, on this very score, that it dares not speak out, but is kept hid by its own friends, and fostered as serpents are? for from what sources have they got together these words of theirs? or from whom have they received what they venture to say? Not any one man can they specify who has supplied it. For who is there in all mankind, Greek or Barbarian, who ventures to rank among creatures Him whom he confesses the while to be God, and says, that He was not till He was made? or who is there, who to the God in whom he has put faith refuses to give credit, when He says, *This is My Beloved Son*, on the pretence that He is not a Son, but a creature? rather, such madness would rouse a universal indignation. Nor, again, does Scripture afford them any pretext; for it has been often shown, and it shall be shown now, that what they teach is alien to the divine oracles. Therefore, since all that remains is to say that from the devil came their mania, (for of such opinions he alone is sower,) proceed we to resist him; for with him is our real conflict, and they are but instruments;—that, the Lord aiding us, and the enemy, as he is wont, being overcome with arguments, they may be put to shame, when they see him without resource who sowed this heresy in them, and may learn, though late, that, as being Arians, they are not Christians.

Chapter IV.

Answer to intellectual objections to the doctrine.

15. At his suggestion then ye have maintained, and ye think, that "there was once when the Son was not;" this is the first cloak of your theory of doctrine which has to be stripped off. Say then what was once when the Son was not, O slanderous and impious men![5] If ye say the Father, your blasphemy is but greater; for it is impious to say that He was at one time, or to signify Him in the word "once." For He is ever, and is now, and as the Son is, so is He, and is Himself He that is, and Father of the Son. But if ye say that the Son was once, when He Himself was not, the answer is unmeaning. For how could He both be and not be? In this difficulty, you can but answer, that there was a time when the Word was not; for your very adverb "once" naturally signifies this. And your other, "The Son was not before His generation," is equivalent to saying, "There was once when He was not," for both the one and the other signify that there is a time before the Word. Ed. Ben. i. § 10—11.

16. Whence then this your discovery? for no passage of Holy Scripture has used such language of the Saviour, but rather "always" and "eternal" and "co-existent always with the Father." For, *In the beginning was the Word*,

[5] Athan. observes that this formula of the Arians is a mere evasion to escape using the word "time," vid. also Cyril. Thesaur. iv. pp. 19, 20. Else let them explain,—"There was," *what* "when the Son was not?" or *what* was before the Son? since He Himself was before all times and ages, which He created. Did they mean, however, that it was the Father who "was" before the Son? This was true, if "before" was taken, not to imply time, but origination or beginning. And in this sense the first verse of St. John's Gospel may be interpreted, "In the Beginning," or Origin, i.e., in the Father, "was the Word." Thus Athan. himself understands that text, Orat. iv. § 1. Vid. also Orat. iii. § 9. Nyssen. contr. Eunom. iii. p. 106. Cyril. Thesaur. p. 312.

CHAP. IV. *and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.* And in the Apocalypse he says, *Who is and who was and who is to come.* Now who can rob "*who is*" and "*who was*" of eternity? This too in confutation of the Jews hath Paul written in his Epistle to the Romans, *Of whom as concerning the flesh is Christ, who is over all, God blessed for ever;* and to shame the Greeks, he has said, *The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal Power and Godhead;* but who the Power of God is, he teaches us elsewhere himself, saying, *Christ God's Power and God's Wisdom.* Surely in these words it is not the Father whom he designates, as ye often have whispered one to another, affirming that the Father is *His eternal power.* This is not so; for he says not, "God Himself is the power," but "His is the power." Very plain is it to all that "His" is not "He;" yet not something alien but rather something proper to Him.

17. Study too the context, and *turn to the Lord;* to that Lord whom the Apostle elsewhere calls the Spirit, to that Son, whom here he calls the Power of God. Then you will see that it is the Son of whom he speaks. For after making mention of the creation, he fitly speaks of the Framer's Power as seen in it, which Power, I say, is the Word of God, by whom all things came to be. Creation is not sufficient of itself to make God known. You may as well say it was sufficient to come into being of itself. As it was through the Son that it was made, so through the Son it speaks of God.[6] As in *Him all things consist,* so

[6] Athan. seems here to give expression to a feeling not uncommon now; that when we contemplate this beautiful visible world, e.g., as its hidden life bursts forth in spring, we recognise in it a unity, power, intelligence, harmony, sweetness, and joyousness, which we may, if we choose, call an *anima mundi*, but which to an ὀρθῶς θεωρῶν is the Primogenitum Verbum Dei witnessing to His Eternal Father. Vid. infr. p. 355.

of necessity, a rightly ordered mind sees the framing Word in it, and through Him begins to apprehend the Father. And if, as the Saviour also says, *No one knoweth the Father, save the Son, and he to whom the Son shall reveal Him*, and if on Philip's asking, *Show us the Father*, He said not, "Behold the creation," but, *He that hath seen Me, hath seen the Father*, reasonably doth Paul, while accusing the Greeks of contemplating the harmony and order of the creation without reflecting on the Framing Word within it, (for the creatures witness to their own Framer,) and as desirous that through the creatures they might apprehend the true God, and abandon creature-worship, reasonably, I say, doth He speak of *His eternal Power and Godhead*, in order thereby to signify that through the Son alone can they interpret creation aright. Ed. Ben. i. § 11–12.

18. And when the sacred writers say *Who exists before the ages*, and *By whom He made the ages*, they thereby as clearly preach the eternal and everlasting being of the Son, even while they are designating God Himself. Thus, if Esaias says, *The Everlasting God who has furnished the ends of the earth;* and Susanna, *O Everlasting God;* and Baruch wrote, *I will cry unto the Everlasting in my days*, and shortly after, *My hope is in the Everlasting, that He will save you, and joy is come unto me from the Holy One;* yet forasmuch as the Apostle, writing to the Hebrews, says, *Who being the Reflection of His glory and the Impress of His Person;* and David, too, in the eighty-ninth Psalm, *And the Brightness of the Lord be upon us*, and, *In Thy Light shall we see Light*, who has so little sense as to doubt of the eternity of the Son? for when did man see light without the reflection of its radiance, that he may say of the Son, "There was once when He was not," or "Before His generation He was not."

19. And the words addressed to the Son in the hundred and forty-fourth Psalm, *Thy kingdom is a kingdom of the*

CHAP. IV.

ages, forbid any one to imagine any interval at all in which the Word did not exist. For if every interval is measured in the ages, and of all the ages the Word is King and Maker, therefore, whereas no interval at all exists prior to Him, it were madness to say, "There was once when the Everlasting was not," and "From nothing is the Son."

20. And whereas the Lord Himself says, *I am the Truth*, not "I became the Truth;" but always, *I am*,—*I am the Shepherd*,—*I am the Light*,—and again, *Call ye Me not, the Lord and the Master? and ye call Me well, for so I am*, who, hearing such language from God, from the Wisdom and Word of the Father, speaking of Himself, will any longer hesitate about its truth, and not forthwith believe that in the phrase *I am*, is signified that the Son is eternal and unoriginate?

21. It is plain then from the above that the Scriptures declare the Son's eternity; it is equally plain from what follows that the Arian phrases "He was not," and "before" and "when," are in the same Scriptures predicated of creatures. Moses, for instance, in his account of the generation of our system, says, *And every plant of the field, before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew; for the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground.* And in Deuteronomy, *When the Most High divided to the nations.* And the Lord said in His own Person, *If ye loved Me, ye would rejoice because I said, I go unto the Father, for my Father is greater than I. And now I have told you before it come to pass, that when it is come to pass, ye might believe.* And concerning the creation He says by Solomon, *Or ever the earth was, when there were no depths, I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills, was I brought forth.* And *Before Abraham was, I am.* And concerning Jeremias He says, *Before I formed thee in*

the womb, I knew thee. And David in the Psalm says, *Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever the earth and the world were made, Thou art God from everlasting and world without end.* And in Daniel, *Susanna cried out with a loud voice and said, O everlasting God, that knowest the secrets, and knowest all things before they come to be.* Ed. Ben. i. § 13—14.

22. Thus it appears that the phrases "once was not," and "before it came to be," and "when," and the like, are fitly used of creatures, which come out of nothing, but are alien to the Word. But if such terms are used in Scripture of things created, but, "ever" of the Word, it follows, that the Son did not come out of nothing, nor is in the number of such things at all, but is the Father's Image and Word eternal, never having not been, but being ever, as the eternal Reflection of a Light which is eternal. Why imagine then times before the Son? or wherefore blaspheme the Word as if He began later than time began,—He by whom even the ages were made? for how did time or age subsist, when the Word, as you say, had not yet appeared, *through whom all things were made, and without* whom *was made not one thing?* Or why, when you do really mean time, do you not plainly say, "a time was when the Word was not?" but you hide the word "time" to deceive the simple, but you do not at all conceal your own spirit, nor, even if you did, could you escape discovery. For you still simply mean times, when you say, "There was when He was not," and "He was not before His generation."

Chapter V.

Answer to intellectual objections.

23. The Son, then, according to Scripture, is eternal, uncreate, and the creating principle of all things. When

CHAP. V. we thus speak, they make answer, "If so, if He eternally co-exists with the Father, call Him no more the Father's Son, but His brother." O insensate and contentious! For if we said only that He was eternally with the Father, and not His Son, their pretended scruple would have some plausibility; but if, while we say that He is eternal, we also confess Him to be the Son from the Father, how can He that is begotten be considered brother of Him who begets? And if our faith contemplates a Father and a Son, what brotherhood is there between them? and how can the Word be called brother of Him whose Word He is? This is not an objection of men really ignorant, for they comprehend how the truth lies; but it is a Jewish pretence, and that of men who, in Solomon's words, *through desire separate themselves* from the truth. For the Father and the Son were not generated from some pre-existing origin, that we may account Them brothers, but the Father is the origin of the Son and begat Him; and the Father is Father, and not the Son of any: and the Son is Son, and not brother.

24. Nor can any fault be found, as they would wish, in speaking of an eternal offspring. So far from His not being eternal because He is the Son, I will say that He could not be the Son unless He were eternal. For consider; was the substance of the Father ever imperfect, so that what belonged to it and was a complement necessary for its perfection was added afterwards? Man is an imperfect being, and soon grows into the maturity of his powers; but God's offspring is eternal, because God's nature is ever perfect. If then the Word be not a real Son of God, but a divine work brought out of nothing and merely called a son, if they can prove this, by all means let them cry out, "Once He was not;" but, if He is in truth Son, as the Father says and the Scriptures proclaim, and a son is nothing else than what is generated

from the father; so that in short the Son of God is to be identified with His Word, and Wisdom, and Radiance; what can we say but that, in maintaining "Once the Son was not," they rob God of His Word, like plunderers, and openly predicate of Him that He was once without His proper Word and Wisdom,[7] and that the Light was once without Radiance, and the Fountain was once barren and dry?[8] For though they pretend to shrink from the name of time, because of those who reproach them with it, and say that He was before times, yet whereas they assign certain intervals, in which they imagine He was not, they are most impious still, as equally suggesting times, and imputing to God's nature an absence of His Word. Ed. Ben. i. § 13—14.

25. This reasoning they cannot meet, if they really hold Him to be the Son of God; but in truth they do not hold Him to be such. In name indeed they do, in order to evade the condemnation which they would otherwise incur, but they use the word "Son" figuratively, and think that we cannot use it in a literal and real, without using it in a material sense. But is it not a grievous error in them, to have material thoughts about what is immaterial, and because of the weakness of their own nature to deny what is natural and proper to the Father? It comes to this, that they ought to deny the Father also, because they understand not how God is, or what the Father is, if, in their folly, they measure by themselves the Offspring of the Father. And men in such a state of mind as to consider that there cannot be a Son of God, demand our pity; however, they must be interrogated and confuted, for the chance of even thus bringing them to their senses

26. Moreover, if, as you say, "the Son is from nothing," and "was not before His generation," He, of course, as well as others, must be called Son and God, and Wisdom, not

[7] Vid. App. γέννησις. [8] Vid. App. τέλειος.

CHAP. V. in the full meaning of the words, but only as a shadow and similitude of the True, that is, He is Son by participation; for thus all other creatures consist, and by sanctification are glorified. You have to tell us, then, of what He is partaker. All other things partake the Spirit, but He, according to you, of what is He partaker? of the Spirit? Nay, rather the Spirit Himself takes from the Son, as He Himself says; and it is not reasonable to say that the latter is sanctified by the former. Therefore it is the Father that the Son partakes; for this only remains to say. Now this, which is participated, what is it or whence? If it be something external, provided by the Father, He will not then be partaker of the Father, but of what is external to Him; and no longer will He be even second after the Father, since He has before Him this other; nor can He be called Son of the Father, but of that, as partaking which, He has been called Son and God. And if this be extravagant and impious, when the Father says, *This is my Beloved Son*, and when the Son says that God is His own Father, it follows that what is partaken is not external, but from the substance of the Father. And as to this again, if it be other than the substance of the Son, an equal extravagance will meet us; there being in that case something between this that is from the Father and the substance of the Son, whatever that be.[9]

27. Therefore it is irrelevant and beside the Truth to say that the Son's participation of the Father consists in anything external to the Father; and if so, it must be of the substance of the Father that He partakes; and if of the substance, it must be a whole participation, for portions and separations are foreign to the idea of things spiritual, and it is all one to say that God is wholly participated and that He begets; and what does begetting

[9] Vid. App. *The Son.*

signify but a real Son? And thus the Son is He of whom all things partake, according to that grace of the Spirit which comes from Him; and this shows that the Son himself partakes of nothing, but what is partaken of by us from the Father is the Son; for, as partaking of the Son Himself, we are said to partake of God; and this is what Peter said, *that ye may be partakers in a divine nature;* as says too the Apostle,[1] *Know ye not that ye are the temple of God?* and, *We are the temple of the Living God.* And beholding the Son, we see the Father; for our conception and comprehension of the Son is knowledge concerning the Father, because He is the proper Offspring from His substance. And there is nothing to hinder our belief in a true and literal Son of God; for God is a Spirit, and in consequence, as He can be partaken of by all beings in their measure, without any separation or injury to His substance, as you would yourselves allow, so it is not difficult to conceive that full and entire participation of His substance by our Lord, which is generation, and constitutes Him the genuine, the true, the Only-begotten Son of God. ED. BEN. i. § 15—16.

28. Coming back then to the eternity of the Son, it appears that His Sonship is no difficulty in the way of believing that eternity, and He is identified with the Father's Word and Wisdom, in and through whom He creates and makes all things;—and His Radiance too, in whom He enlightens all things, and is revealed to whom He will;—and His Impress and Image also, in whom He is contemplated and known, whereby *He and His Father are one*, and whoso looketh on Him, looketh on the Father;—and the Christ, in whom all things are redeemed, and the new creation wrought afresh. And on the other hand, the Son being such Offspring, it is not fitting, rather it is full of peril, to say that He is a work out of nothing, or that

[1] Vid. *Apostle.*

CHAP. VI. He was not before His generation. Nor is this all :—For he who thus speaks of that which belongs to the Father's substance, already blasphemes the Father Himself; since necessarily wrong thoughts of Him are involved in false imaginations about His Son.

CHAPTER VI.

Answer to intellectual objections.

29. Though this is enough in refutation of the heresy, its heterodoxy will appear from reasons such as the following: if God be Maker of all things by means of His Son, to deprive the Son of this necessary prerogative is, in fact, to deprive the Eternal Father of His creative power. Again, if the Son once was not, then the Triad is not from eternity, but was a Monad first, and afterwards a Triad, and so the true knowledge which we have of God grew, it seems, and took shape.[2] Then again, if the Son has come out of nothing, I suppose the whole Triad came out of nothing too, or, what is more serious still, being Divine, it included in its unity a created thing, which has worship and glory together with Him-who-is ever, and is made up of strange and alien natures and substances. Is this a teaching endurable as regards so august a Truth? Is this an intelligible worship, which is so inconsistent with itself, as being at one time yes, and at another no? For what we know, it will receive, as time goes on, some fresh accession, and so on without limit; since by way of accessions at first

[2] As the name of the Holy Trinity has been used from the first and by our Lord's institution as the name of initiation in the instance of every one admitted into the Church, it is a virtual proof of our Lord's divinity prior to and more authoritative than the Scripture texts concerning it and catechetical tradition.

and at starting it received its consistence. And so doubtless it may decrease on the contrary, for addition plainly admits of subtraction. But this is not so; perish the thought! the Triad is not thus brought into being. It is not generate; but there is an eternal and one Godhead in a Triad; and of that Holy Triad there is one glory; and ye presume to divide it into different natures. The Father is eternal, and yet ye say of the Word which is enthroned with Him, "Once He was not;" and whereas the Son is enthroned with the Father, yet ye think to place Him far from Him. The Triad is Creator and Framer, and yet ye fear not to degrade It to things which are from nothing; ye scruple not to make slaves equal to the Majesty of the Three, and to rank the King, the Lord of Sabaoth, with His subjects. Ed. Ben. i. § 16—18.

30. Cease then to confuse together ideas which are incompatible, or rather, confuse not what is-not, with Him-that-is. Such statements do not glorify and honour the Lord of all, but the reverse; for he who dishonours the Son, dishonours also the Father. For if theological truth has its perfection in a Triad now, and this is the true and only divine worship, and this is the good and the truth, it must always have been so, unless the good and the true be something that came after, and the truth of God's nature is completed by additions. I say, it must have been eternally so; but if not eternally, not so at present either, but at present only so as you suppose it was from the first;—so as not to be a Triad now. But such heretics no Christian would bear; for it belongs to Greeks to introduce a Triad which is generate, and to level It with things which came into being; for these do admit of deficiencies and additions; but the faith of Christians acknowledges the blessed Trinity as unalterable and perfect and ever what It was; neither adding to It what is more, nor imputing to It any loss, for both ideas are impious. And therefore that faith dissociates It from all things which came to be, and guards and

CHAP. VI. worships the unity of the Godhead as indivisible, and shuns the Arian blasphemies, and confesses and acknowledges that the Son was ever; for He is eternal, as is the Father, of whom He is the Eternal Word; and now for further proof of this.

31. I say then the eternity of the Son and His unity of substance with the Father are manifested in those titles, which I have already incidentally insisted on, of Stream from the Fountain, Word, Wisdom and Image. For instance, if God be, and be called, the Fountain of Wisdom and Life,—as He says by Jeremiah, *They have forsaken Me, the Fountain of living waters;* and again, *A glorious high throne from the beginning, is the place of our sanctuary; O Lord, the Hope of Israel, all that forsake Thee shall be ashamed, and they that depart from Thee shall be written in the earth, because they have forsaken the Lord, the Fountain of living waters;* and in the book of Baruch it is written, *Thou hast forsaken the Fountain of Wisdom,*—this implies that Life and Wisdom are not foreign to the Substance of the Fountain, but belong to It, nor were at any time without existence, but were always. Now the Son is all this, who says, *I am the Life*, and, *I Wisdom dwell with prudence.* Is it not then impious to say, "Once the Son was not"? for it is all one with saying, "Once the Fountain was dry, destitute of Life and Wisdom." But a fountain it would then cease to be; for what begetteth not from itself cannot be called a fountain. What a freight of extravagance is here! for God promises that those who do His will shall be as a fountain which the water fails not, saying by Isaiah the prophet, *And the Lord shall satisfy thy soul in drought, and make thy bones fat; and thou shalt be like a watered garden, and like a spring of water, whose waters fail not.* And yet these men, whereas God is called and is a Fountain of Wisdom, dare to insult Him as barren and void once of His proper Wisdom.

But their doctrine is false; truth witnessing that God is the eternal Fountain of His proper Wisdom; and, if the Fountain be eternal, the Wisdom also must needs be eternal. For in It were all things made, as David says in the Psalm, *In Wisdom hast Thou made them all;* and Solomon says, *The Lord by Wisdom hath formed the earth, by understanding hath He established the heavens.* ED. BEN. i. § 19.

32. And this Wisdom is the Word, for by Him, as John says, *all things were made*, and *without Him was made not one thing*.[3] And this Word is Christ; for *there is One God the Father, from whom are all things, and we for Him; and One Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through Him.* And if all things are through Him, He Himself is not to be reckoned within that "all." For he who dares to call Christ, through whom are all things, one of that "all," is bound also to include in that "all" God Himself, from whom are all. But if he shrinks from this as extravagant, and excludes God from that all, it is but consistent that he should also exclude from that all the Only-begotten Son, as being proper to the Father's substance. And, if He be not one of that all, it is a sin to say concerning Him, "He was not," and "He was not before His generation." Such words may be used of the creatures; but as to the Son, He is such as the Father is, of whose substance He is proper Offspring, Word, and Wisdom. For a relation like this belongs to the Son, as regards the Father, and to the Father as regards the Son; so that we may neither say that God was ever without His Rational Word,[4] nor that the Son was non-existing. For what is meant by a Son, if He be not from Him? or by Word and Wisdom, except what is ever proper to Him? When then was God without Him who belongs to Him? or how can a man consider that which belongs, as foreign and alien in substance? for other

[3] Vid. *Scripture.*

[4] Vid. App. ἄλογος.

CHAP. VI. things according to their nature as being creatures, are without likeness in substance to the Maker, but are external to Him, made by the Word at His grace and will, and thus admitting of sometimes ceasing to be, if it so pleases Him who made them; (for such is the nature of things that are made;) but as to what belongs to the Father's substance, (for this we have already found to be the Son,) what daring is it and impiety to say that "This comes from nothing," and that "It was not before its generation," but was adventitious, and can at some time again cease to be?

33. Let a man only dwell upon this thought, and he will discern how the perfection and the plenitude of the Father's substance is impaired by this heresy; still more clearly, however, he will see its extravagance if he considers that the Son is also the Image and Radiance of the Father, and Impress, and Truth. For if, when Light exists, there be withal its Image, viz., Radiance, and if, a Subsistence existing, there be of it the entire Impress, and a Father existing, there be His Truth; let them consider what depths of impiety they fall into, who make time the measure of the Image and Countenance [5] of the Godhead. For if "the Son was not before His generation," Truth was not always in God, which it were a sin to say; for since the Father was, there was ever in Him the Truth, which is the Son, who says, *I am the Truth.* And the Subsistence existing, of course there was forthwith its Impress and Image; for God's Image is not delineated from without, but God Himself hath begotten it; in which seeing Himself, He has delight, as the Son Himself says, *I was His delight.* When then did the Father not see Himself in His own Image? or when had He not delight, that a man should dare to say, "The Image is out of nothing," and "The Father had not

[5] Vid. App. εἶδος.

delight before the Image was generated"? and how should the Maker and Creator see Himself in a created and generated substance; for such as is the Father, such must be His Image. Only consider then the attributes of the Father, and then, if the Son be His Image, you will understand what He must be. The Father is eternal, immortal, powerful, Light, King, Sovereign, God, Lord, Creator, and Maker. These attributes must be in the Image, to make it true that *he that hath seen* the Son *hath seen the Father*. If the Son be not all this, but, as the Arians consider, a thing made, and not eternal, this is not a true Image of the Father, unless indeed they give up shame, and go on to say, that the title of Image, given to the Son, is not a token of a similar substance,[6] but is His name only. But this, on the other hand, O ye Christ's enemies, is not an Image, nor is it an Impress. For what is the likeness of a being brought out of nothing to Him who brought what was nothing into being? or how can that which is-not, be like Him that-is, being short of Him in once not-being, and in its having its place among things that have come to be? Ed. Ben. i. § 20—21.

34. However, such the Arians wishing Him to be, have contrived arguments of this kind:—"If the Son is the Father's Offspring and Image, and is like in all things to the Father, then it necessarily holds that as He is begotten, so He begets, and He too becomes father of a son. And again, he who is begotten from Him, begets in his turn, and so on without limit; for nothing short of this it is to make the Begotten like Him that begat Him." Authors of blasphemy, verily, are these foes of God! who, sooner than confess that the Son is the Father's Image, conceive material and earthly ideas concerning the Father Himself, ascribing to Him severings and effluences and influences. If then God be as man, let Him become also a parent as

[6] Here Athan. recognises the Homœüsion of the Semi-arians.

CHAP. VI. man, so that His Son should be father of another, and so in succession one from another, till the series they imagine grows into a multitude of gods. But if God be not as man, as He is not, we must not impute to Him the attributes of man. For brutes and men, after a Framer has set them off, are begotten by succession; and the son, having been begotten of a father who was a son, becomes accordingly in his turn to a son a father, as having in himself from his father that gift by which he himself has come to be. Hence in such instances there is not, properly speaking, either father or son, nor does the idea of father or the idea of son stay in their case, for the same man becomes both son and father, son of his father, and father of his son. But it is not so in the Godhead; for not as man is God; for neither is the Father from Father; (and therefore it is that He doth not beget one who shall beget;) nor is the Son from effluence of the Father, nor is He begotten from a father that was begotten; therefore neither is He so begotten that He should beget. Thus it belongs to the Godhead alone, that the Father is eminently Father, and the Son eminently Son, and in Them, and Them only, does it hold that the Father is ever Father and the Son ever Son.

35. Therefore he who asks why the Son has not a son, must inquire why the Father had not a father. But both suppositions are out of place and impious exceedingly. For as the Father is ever Father, and never could be Son, so the Son is ever Son, and never could be Father. For in this rather is He shown to be the Father's Impress and Image, remaining what He is and not changing, but thus receiving from the Father to be one and the same.[7] If then the Father change, let the Image change; for such is the relation of the Image and Radiance towards Him who begat It. But if the Father is immutable, and what

[7] ταὐτότητα.

He is that He continues to be, necessarily does the Image also continue what He is, and will not alter. Now He is Son from the Father; therefore He will not become other than is proper to the Father's substance. Idly then have the foolish ones devised this objection also, wishing to separate the Image from the Father, that they might level the Son with things generated. Ed. Ben. i. § 21—22

Chapter VII.

Answer to intellectual objections.

36. Ranking Him among these, according to the teaching of Eusebius, and accounting Him to be such as are the things which come into being through Him, the Arians revolted from the truth, and at the beginning, when they were commencing this heresy, were used to go about with phrases of craft which they had got together; nay, up to this time some of them, when they fall in with boys in the market-place,[8] question them, not out of divine Scripture at all, but thus, as if bursting out with *the abundance of their heart*:—He-that-is, did He, from Him-that-is, make Him who was-not, or Him-who-was? therefore did He make the Son, whereas He-was, or whereas He-was-not? And again, "Is the ingenerate one or two?" and "Has He free-will, and yet at His own choice does not alter, as being of an alterable nature? for He is not as a stone to remain by Himself without movement." Next they turn to women, and address them in turn in this womanish language, "Hadst thou a son before bearing? now, as thou hadst not, so neither was the Son of God in being before His generation." With such words do the disgraceful men sport and revel, and liken God to men,

[8] Vid. Append. *Arians.*

CHAP. VII

pretending to be Christians, but changing God's glory *into an image made like to corruptible man.*

37. Objections so shallow deserve no answer at all; however, lest their heresy appear to have any foundation, it may be right, though we go out of the way for it, to refute them even here, especially on account of the women who are so easily deceived by them. When they thus speak, they should inquire of an architect, whether he can build without materials; and if he cannot, whether it follows that God could not make the universe without materials. Or they should ask whether any one of the whole race of men can be without his place; and if he cannot, whether it follows that God is in place; that so they may be brought to shame even by their audience. Or why is it that, on hearing that God has a Son, they deny Him by the parallel of themselves; whereas, if they hear that He creates and makes, no longer do they object their human parallels? they ought, when they discuss the subject of creation, to introduce their human ideas into it, and to supply God with materials, and so deny Him to be Creator, till they end in herding with Manichees. But if the idea of God transcends such thoughts, and, on very first hearing of Him, one believes and knows that He exists, not as we exist, and yet that He does exist as God, and creates not as men create, but still creates as God, it is plain that He begets also not as men beget, but begets as God. For God does not make man His pattern; but rather we men, because God is eminently, and alone truly, Father of His Son, are also called fathers of our own children; for of Him *is every fatherhood in heaven and earth named.* Thus their positions, while unscrutinised, have a show of sense; but if any one scrutinise them by reason, they will be found to merit much derision and mockery.

38. For first of all, as to their first question, which is such as this,—how vague it is!—they do not explain who it

is they ask about, so as to allow of an answer, but they say abstractedly, "He-who-is," "Him who-is-not."[9] They profess to have thrown their question into such a shape as to compel an answer of decisive force against the eternity of the Word; but only apply it to actual instances, and you will find that it will not hold. Who then "is," and what things "are not," O Arians? or who "is," and who "is not"? what things are said "to be," what "not to be"? for He-that-is, can make things which are not, and things which are, and things which were already. For instance, carpenter, and goldsmith, and potter, each, according to his own art, works upon materials previously existing, making what vessels he pleases; and "He that is," namely, the God of all, having taken the dust of the earth, existing and already brought into being, fashions man; and that very earth, again, whereas once it was not, He has in its time brought into being by His own Word. If then this is the meaning of their question the creature on the one hand before its creation plainly was not before it came to be, and men, on the other, work the existing material, "that which was;" and thus their reasoning is inconsequent, since both "what is" comes to be, and "what is not" comes to be, as these instances show. So much as regards works, which are external to God's substance; but it is otherwise with what is internal to It. If they speak concerning God and His Word, let

[9] This objection is found supr. Encycl. p. 4, ὁ ὢν θεὸς τὸν μὴ ὄντα ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος. Again, ὄντα γεγέννηκε ἢ οὐκ ὄντα. Greg. Orat. 29, 9, who answers it. Pseudo-Basil, contr. Eunom. iv. p. 281, 2. Basil calls the question πολυθρύλλητον, contr. Eunom. ii. 14. It will be seen to be but the Arian formula of "He was not before His generation" in another shape; being but this, that the very fact of His being begotten, that is, a Son, implies a beginning, that is, a time when He was not; it being by the very force of the words absurd to say that "God begat Him that *was*," or to deny that "God begat Him that was *not*." For the symbol, οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γεννηθῇ, vid. Dissert. 3 in the author's Theol. Tracts.

CHAP. VII. them complete their question and then ask, Was the God "who-is" ever without rational Word? and, whereas He is Light, was He rayless? or was He always Father of the Word? Or again in this manner, Has the Father "who-is" made the Word "who-is-not," or, as He has been ever, so has He ever had with Him His Word, as the proper Offspring of His substance? But such idle sophistry scarcely requires an answer, in the face of the many Scripture testimonies which I have adduced above, John saying, *In the beginning was the Word*, and Paul, *Who being the Brightness of His glory*, and *Who is over all, God blessed for ever, Amen.*

39. However, if I must answer them, I am forced to use words after their own pattern of irreverence. After many prayers[10] then that God would be gracious to us, thus we might ask them in turn: God who-is, has He too so become, whereas He was-not? or is He also before He came to be? whereas then He-is, did He make Himself, or is He of nothing, and being nothing before, did He suddenly appear? Out of place is such a question, and very blasphemous too, yet parallel with theirs; for whichever answer they give, it abounds in impiety. But if it be blasphemous and utterly impious thus to inquire about God, it will be blasphemous too to make the like inquiries about His Word. I am obliged thus to speak in order to expose their shallow interrogation, for whereas God is, He was eternally; since then the Father is ever, His Radiance ever is, which is His Word. And again, God who is, hath from Himself His Word who also is; and neither hath the Word been added, whereas He was not before, nor was the Father once without a Word. For this assault upon the Son makes the blasphemy recoil upon the Father; as if He devised for Himself a Wisdom, and Word, and Son from without; for whichever of these

[10] Vid. Append. *Athanasius.*

titles we use, we denote the Offspring from the Father, as has been said. As then if a person saw the sun, and then inquired concerning its radiance, and said, "Did that which-is make that which-was, or that which-was-not," he would be held not to reason sensibly, but to have lost his senses, because he fancied that what comes altogether from the light was external to it, and was raising questions, how and where and when it were made; in like manner, thus to speculate concerning the Son and the Father, and thus to inquire, is far greater madness, for it is to speak of the Word of the Father as external to Him, and to image His natural Offspring as a work, with the avowal "He was not before His generation." This is the direct answer to their question; however, if they want another, let them recollect that, when the *Word was made flesh*, the Father, who-was, "made" the Son who-was,—made Him man. Whereas He was Son of God, He made Him in consummation of the ages also Son of Man; this they must grant, unless forsooth, after Samosatene, they affirm that He did not even exist at all, till He became man. Ed. Ben. i. § 24–26.

40. This is sufficient from us in answer to their first question; and now on your part, O Arians, remembering your own words, tell us whether for the framing of the universe, He who-was had need of Him who-was-not, or of Him who-was? You said that He made for Himself His Son out of nothing, as an instrument whereby to make the universe. Which, then, is superior, that which needs or that which supplies the need? or does not each supply the deficiency of the other? You rather prove the weakness of the Maker,[1] if He had not power of Himself to make the universe, but provided for Himself an instrument[2] from without, as carpenter might do, or shipwright, unable to work anything without axe and saw? Can anything

[1] Vid. supr. 12, p. 20.

[2] Vid. App. ὄργανον.

CHAP. VIII. be more impious! yet why should one dwell on its heinousness, when enough has gone before to show that their doctrine is a mere fantasy?

CHAPTER VIII.

Answer to intellectual objections.

41. As to the question which they put to women, "Hadst thou a son before he was born?" no answer need be given by us but that which has been given already, namely, that it is not right to measure a divine act by the parallel of the nature of man. However, not to insist upon this, but to take their own ground, this at least they must grant, that a son, though necessarily younger than his father, is still his father's offspring, from his substance, and proper to him, not from without, and his image. If then we are to argue from human instances, why do they so insist on the relation of son to father as involving in the son a beginning of being, and are silent about its involving a sameness of nature?

42. This at first sight, but I will go further: the Son of God has no beginning because of that sameness. In the idea of a divine generation, sameness of nature actually precludes a beginning of being. Why that sameness between a human father and son, except that a son has ever been in the father even before his separate existence? Levi was in the loins of his ancestor Abraham from the first. But time is necessary for the operation of man's nature. As soon then as the restraints upon his nature are removed, he becomes father of a child, who hitherto existed within him. So it must be, for man does but grow into his perfection; but who is to introduce restraints and growth into our idea of God? Who is to deny that what

He is now, that He has been, and all that is His has been, from all eternity? That the Son is eternal is involved in the very idea of sonship, for sonship belongs to the Divine Nature. And the force of this reasoning is confirmed by what we are told about the Son, as the Radiance of the Father, and about the Father as the Fountain of the Son. For when was a fountain without its stream, when was a light without its radiance? Shall these works of God be more perfect than their Maker? Shall His Son which is so one with Him be with an interval before existence, whereas these creatures of His hands have none? Thus the question of heretics to parents exposes their perverseness; they confess the point of nature, and now are put to shame on the point of time. ED. BEN. i. § 26—28.

43. Nor is this all. Further to intimate, as regards the Son, both the use and the abuse of this argument from earthly similitudes, Divine Scripture supplies us with other parallels to direct our faith by, when it calls the Son of God His Word and His Wisdom. For the Word of God is His Son, and the Son is Word and Wisdom of the Father; and Word and Wisdom is neither creature nor part of Him whose Word He is, nor the offspring of a passion. Uniting then the two titles,[3] Scripture speaks of "Son" in order to preach the natural and true Offspring of His substance; and, on the other hand, that none may think of the Offspring humanly, therefore while signifying His substance it also calls Him Word, Wisdom, and Radiance; to teach us that the generation was without passion, and eternal, and worthy of God. What affection then or what part of the Father is the Word and the Wisdom and the Radiance? So much may be impressed even on these men of folly; for, as they ask women concerning God's Son, so let them inquire of men concerning the Word, and they will find that the word which issues from them

[3] Vid. supr. p. 27, and Append. *Economical language.*

CHAP. VIII. is neither an affection of them nor a part of their mind. But if such be the nature of men, who are passible and partitive, why speculate they about passions and portions in the instance of the immaterial and indivisible God, that under pretence of reverence they may deny the true and natural generation of the Son? What is said of the Word may be said of the Wisdom too. Men are capable and are partakers of Wisdom; God partakes of nothing. He is His own Wisdom and is Father thereof; and that His Wisdom is not occasional, mutable, alterable, but an Offspring proper to His substance. Wherefore, if He is now Father, He has ever been Father, for to be Father implies fuller perfection, and He is all perfect.

44. But, observe, say they, God was always a Maker, nor is the power of framing adventitious to Him; does it follow then, that, because He is the Framer of all, therefore His works also are eternal, and is it wicked to say of them, too, that they were not before generation? What a shallow answer! for what likeness is there between Son and work, that they should parallel a father's with a maker's function? How is it that, with that difference between offspring and work, which has been pointed out already, they remain so ill-instructed? I repeat, then, that a work is external to the maker, but a son is the proper offspring of the substance; it follows that a work need not have been always, for the workman frames it when he will; but an offspring is not subject to will, but belongs to the substance. And a man may be and may be called workman, though the works are not as yet; but father he cannot be called, nor can he be, unless a son exist. And if they curiously inquire why God, though always with the power to make, does not always make, (though *who hath known the mind of the Lord, or who hath been His Counsellor?* or how *shall the thing formed say* to the potter, *Why hast thou made me thus?* however, not to leave even a

weak argument unnoticed,) they must be told, that although God from eternity had the power to make, yet creatures had not the capacity for being made from eternity. For they are out of nothing, and therefore were not before they came into being, and therefore could not co-exist with the ever-existing God? Wherefore God, looking to what was good for them, then made them all when He saw that, upon their coming into being, they would be able to abide. And as, though He was able, even from the beginning, in the time of Adam, or Noe, or Moses, to send His own Word, yet He sent Him not until the consummation of the ages, for this He saw to be good for the whole creation; so also, as to His works, He made them when He would, and as was good for them. But the Son, not being a work, but proper to the Father's substance, always is; for, whereas the Father always is, so that which belongs to His substance must always be; and this is His Word and His Wisdom. And that creatures should not be in existence, does not disparage the Maker; for He hath the power of framing them when He wills; but for the Offspring not to be ever with the Father, is a disparagement of the perfection of His substance. Wherefore His works were framed, when He would, through His Word; but the Son not when He would, for He is ever the proper Offspring of the Father's substance. Ed. Ben. i. § 28—29.

Chapter IX.[4]

Answer to intellectual objections.

45. But as it seems, a heretic is a wicked thing in truth, and in every respect his heart is depraved and goes after

[4] This chapter is transferred here from the end of the third Oration (iii. § 58--67) as being there a sort of Postscript, and properly belonging to the series of intellectual objections and their

CHAP. IX. impiety. For behold, though convicted on all points, and shown to be utterly bereft of understanding, they feel no shame; but as the hydra of Gentile fable, when its former serpents were destroyed, gave birth to fresh ones, contending against the slayer of the old by the production of new, so also they, hostile and hateful to God, as hydras, losing their life in the objections which they advance, invent for themselves other questions, Judaic and foolish, and new expedients, as if Truth were their enemy, thereby to show the rather that they are Christ's opponents in all things. After so many proofs against them, they begin again, sometimes in whispers, sometimes with the persistent iteration of gnats: "Be it so," say they; "interpret these places thus, and gain the victory in reasoning and in proof; still you must say that the Son has been begotten by the Father at His will and pleasure;" and thus it is that they deceive many, putting forward the will and the pleasure of God. Now if any orthodox believer were to say this in simplicity, there would be no cause to be suspicious of the expression, the orthodox intention prevailing over that somewhat simple use of words. But, since the phrase is from the heretics, and the words of heretics are suspicious, and, as it is written, *The wicked are deceitful*, and *The words of the wicked are deceit*, even though they but make signs, for their heart is depraved, come, let us examine this phrase also, lest, though convicted on all sides, still, as hydras, they invent a fresh word, and, by such clever language and specious evasion, they contrive a fresh sowing of that impiety of theirs in another way. For he who says, "The Son came to be at the Divine Will," has the same meaning as another who says, "Once He was not," and "The Son came into being

answers, with which the work opens, and that both in respect to its subject and its language.

out of nothing," and "He is a creature." But since they are now ashamed of those phrases, the crafty ones have endeavoured to convey their meaning in another way, using the word "will," as cuttlefish put forth their blackness, thereby to confuse the innocent, and to make sure of their peculiar heresy. Ed. Ben. iii. § 58–60.

46. For whence do they derive "by will and pleasure"? or from what Scripture? let these men say, who are so suspicious in their language and so inventive of impieties. For the Father, when revealing from heaven His own Word, declared, *This is My beloved Son;* and by David He said, *My heart has burst with a good Word;* and John He bade say, *In the beginning was the Word;* and David says in the Psalm, *With Thee is the well of Life, and in Thy light shall we see light;* and the Apostle writes, *Who being the Radiance of His Glory*, and again, *Who being in the form of God*, and, *Who is the Image of the invisible God.* All the sacred writers everywhere tell us of the being of the Word, but none of His being made "by will," nor of His making at all; but as to these men, where, I ask, did they find "will or good pleasure antecedent" to the Word of God, unless forsooth, leaving the Scriptures, they simulate the perverseness of Valentinus? For Ptolemy the Valentinian said that the Ingenerate had a pair of attributes, Thought and Will, and first He thought and then He willed; and what He thought, He could not put forth, unless when the power of the will was added. Thence the Arians taking a lesson, wish will and good-pleasure to precede the Word. As to them, then, let them rival the doctrine of Valentinus; but we, on reading the divine discourses, have only found *He was* applied to the Son, and of Him only did we hear as being in the Father and the Father's Image; while in the case of things made, since by nature these things once were not, but afterwards came to be, in them only did we recognise an antecedent will and pleasure, David saying in the hundred and

CHAP. IX. thirteenth Psalm, *As for our God He is in heaven, He hath done whatsoever pleased Him;* and in the hundred and tenth, *The works of the Lord are great, sought out unto all His good pleasure;* and again, in the hundred and thirty-fourth, *Whatsoever the Lord pleased, that did He in heaven, and in earth, and in the sea, and in all deep places.*

47. If then the Son be work and thing made, and one among others, let Him, as others, be said "by will" to have come to be, for Scripture shows that these are thus brought into being. And Asterius, the counsel for the heresy, acquiesces, when he thus writes, "For if it be unworthy of the Framer of all to make at pleasure, let His being pleased to act be removed equally in the case of all, that His Majesty be preserved unimpaired. Or if it be befitting God to will, then let this better way obtain in the case of the first Offspring. For it is not possible that it should be fitting for one and the same God to will in creating and also not to will." In spite of the sophist having introduced abundant impiety into these words, namely, that the Offspring and the thing made are the same, and that the Son is one offspring out of all the existing offsprings, he ends with the conclusion that the works may be fittingly said to be by will and pleasure. Therefore if the Son be other than all things, as has been above shown, or rather through Him the works came to be, let not "by will" be applied to Him; otherwise, He so came into being, just as those works consist which came to be through Him. Paul, for instance, whereas he was not before, became afterwards an Apostle *by the will of God;* and our own calling, whereas it once was not but took place afterwards, is preceded by will; and, as Paul himself says again, was determined *according to the good pleasure of His will*, and what Moses relates, *Let there be Light*, and *Let the earth appear*, and *Let Us make man*, is, I think, according to what has been said before, significant of the will of the

Agent. For things which once were not, but exist afterwards from external causes, these the Framer, after counselling, makes; but His proper Word begotten from Him by nature, concerning Him He did not counsel beforehand; for it is in Him that the Father makes, in Him that He frames, those other things whatever He counsels; as also James the Apostle teaches, saying, *Of His own will begat He us with the Word of truth.* Therefore the Will of God concerning all things, whether they be begotten again, or are brought into being once only, is in His Word, in whom He both makes and begets again what seems right to Him; as the Apostle also signifies, writing to the Thessalonians: *for this is the pleasure of God in Christ Jesus concerning you.* Ed. Ben. iii. § 60—61.

48. But consider;—if in the Word Himself, through whom He makes, is in truth also His Will, and if in Christ is the pleasure of the Father, how can He, as others, come into being by will and pleasure? For if He too came, as you maintain, by will, it follows that the will concerning Him consists in some other Word, through whom He in turn comes to be; (for it has been shown that God's Will is not in the things which He brings into being, but in Him through whom and in whom all things made are brought to be,) that is, in other words, to say that the Son became such by will is all one with saying that, "Once He was not;" therefore let them make up their minds to say, "Once He was not," that, whereas an interval of time is signified by the latter formula, they may with shame perceive that also to say "by will" is to place an interval before the Son; for counselling goes before things which once were not, as in the case of all creatures. But if the Word is the Framer of the creatures, and He co-exists with the Father, how can the Father's act of counsel precede the Everlasting Son as if He were not? for if counsel precedes, how through Him are all things? Rather in that case, He too, as one among others, is by will begotten to be a Son, as we also were

CHAP. IX. made sons by the *Word of Truth;* and it remains for us, as was said, to seek another Word, through whom He too was brought to be, and was begotten together with all things, which were according to God's pleasure.

49. If then there is another Word of God, then be the Son brought into being by that Word; but if there be not, as is the truth, but all things by Him were brought to be, which the Father has willed, does not this expose the many-headed[5] craftiness of these men? I mean that feeling ashamed to say "work," and "creature," and "God's Word was not before His generation," yet in another way they still maintain that He is a creature, putting forward "will," and saying, "Unless He has by will come to be, therefore God had a Son by necessity and against His good pleasure." And who is it then who imposes necessity on Him, O men most wicked, who draw everything to the purpose of your heresy? for what is contrary to will they see; but what is greater and transcends it, has escaped their perception. For as what is beside purpose is contrary to will, so what is according to nature transcends and precedes counselling. A man by counsel builds a house, but by nature he begets a son; and what, after being first willed is then built, had a beginning of being, and is external to the maker; but the son is proper offspring of the father's substance, and is not external to him; wherefore neither does he counsel concerning his making, lest he appear to counsel about himself. As far then as the Son transcends the creature, by so much does what is by nature transcend the will; and these men, on hearing of Him, ought not to measure by will what is by nature. Forgetting however that they are hearing about

[5] The allusion, as before, is to the hydra, with its ever-springing heads, as explained at the beginning of this chapter, and infr. n. 52, and with a special allusion to Asterius, who, supr. p. 87, is called πολυκέφαλος σοφιστής.

God's Son, they dare to apply human contrarieties in the instance of God, namely, "necessity" and "beside purpose," to be able thereby to deny that there is a true Son of God. Ed. Ben. iii. § 62–66.

50. For let them tell us themselves,—that God is good and merciful, does this attach to Him by will or not? if by will, we must consider that He began to be good, and that His not being good is possible; for to counsel and choose implies an inclination two ways, and is the property of a rational nature. But if it be too extravagant that He should be considered good and merciful at His mere will, then what they have said themselves must be retorted on them,—"therefore by necessity and not with His good-will He is good;" and, "who is it that imposes this necessity on Him?" But if to speak of necessity in the case of God is an extravagance, and therefore it is by nature that He is good, much more is He, and more truly, Father of the Son by nature and not by will. Moreover let them answer us this:—(for against their profaneness I wish to urge a further question, bold indeed, but with a pious intent; be propitious, O Lord!) [6]—the Father Himself, does He exist, first having taken counsel with Himself, then being pleased, or else before counselling? For since they are as bold in the instance of the Word, they must receive the like answer, that they may know that this their presumption reaches even to the Father Himself. If then they say that even the Father is from will, what was He before He counselled, or what gained He, as ye consider, after counselling? But if such a question be extravagant and self-destructive, and shocking even to ask, (for it is enough only to hear God's Name for us to know and understand that He is He-That-Is,) how is it not also against reason to have parallel thoughts concerning the Word of God, and to make

[6] Vid. App. *Athanasius.*

CHAP. IX. pretences of "will" and "pleasure"? for it is enough in like manner only to hear the Name of the Word, in order to know and understand, that He who not by will is God, has not by will but by nature His proper Word. And does it not surpass all conceivable madness, to entertain the bare thought, that God Himself counsels and considers and chooses and resolves to have a good pleasure, in order that He be not without Word and without Wisdom, but may have both? for it is like raising a question about one's own existence, to take measures for gaining what belongs to one's very nature.

51. There being then much blasphemy in such thoughts, it will be pious to say that things that are made have come to be "by favour and will," but the Son is not a work of will, nor has come second, as the creation, but is by God's nature the proper Offspring of God's Substance. For His being the proper Word of the Father hinders us from speculating on any act of will as previous to Himself, since He is Himself the Father's Living Will,[7] and Power, and is Framer of the things which seemed good to the Father. And this is what He says of Himself in the Proverbs: *Will is Mine and security, Mine is understanding, and Mine strength.* For as, although Himself the *Wisdom*, in which God prepared the heavens, and Himself *Strength and Power*, (for Christ is *God's Power and God's Wisdom*,) He here has altered the terms and said *Mine is discretion, is understanding*, and *Mine strength*, so while He says, *Mine is Will*, He must Himself be the Living Will of the Father; as we have learned from the Prophet also, that He is become *the Angel of great Purpose*, and is called the good pleasure of the Father; for thus we must refute them—using human illustrations concerning God. Therefore if the works subsist "by will and favour," and the whole creature is made "at God's good pleasure," and

[7] Vid. *βουλή*.

Paul was called to be an Apostle *by the Will of God*, and our calling has come about *by His good pleasure and will*, and all things have been brought into being through the Word, He is external to the things which have come to be by will, but rather is Himself the Living Purpose of the Father, by whom all these things were brought to be; by whom holy David also gives thanks in the seventy-second Psalm, *Thou hast holden me by my right hand; Thou shalt guide me with Thy Purpose.* Ed. Ben. iii. § 63—64.

52. How then can the Word, being the Purpose and Good Pleasure of the Father, come into being Himself "by good pleasure and will" as every one else? unless, as I said before, in their madness they repeat that He was brought into being by Himself or by some other. Who then is it by whom He came to be? let them fashion another Word; and let them name another Christ, rivalling the doctrine of Valentinus; for Scripture it is not. And though they fashion another, yet assuredly he too comes into being through some one; and so while we are thus reckoning up and investigating the succession of causes, this many-headed heresy of the Atheïsts is discovered to issue in polytheism and madness unlimited; by which, wishing the Son to be a creature and from nothing, they imply the same thing in other words by putting forth "will" and "pleasure," which rightly belong to things brought into being and creatures. Is it not impious then to impute the characteristics of things that come to be to the Framer of all? and is it not blasphemous to say that Will was in the Father before the Word? for if Will precedes in the Father, the Son's words are not true, *I in the Father;* or even if He is in the Father, yet He will have but a second place, and it became Him not to say *I in the Father*, since Will was before Him, by which all things were brought into being and He Himself subsisted, as you hold. For though He excel in

CHAP. IX. glory, He is not the less one of the things which by Will come into being. And, as we have said before, if it be so, how is He Lord and they servants? but He is Lord of all because He is one with the Father's Lordship; and the creation is all in servitude, since it is external to the oneness of the Father, and whereas it once was not, was brought to be.

53. Moreover, if they say that the Son is by God's Will, they should say also that He came to be by God's judgment; for I consider judgment and will to be the same. For what a man counsels, about that also he has judgment; and what he has in judgment, that also he counsels. Certainly the Saviour Himself has made them correspond as being cognate, when He says, *Counsel is Mine and security; Mine is judgment, and Mine strength.* For as strength and security are the same, (for they mean one attribute;) so we may say that Judgment and Will are the same, which is the Lord. But these impious men are unwilling that the Son should be Word and Living Will; but they fable that there is with God, as if a habit coming and going,[8] after the manner of men, judgment, counsel, wisdom; and they leave nothing undone, even to putting forward the "Thought" and "Will" of Valentinus, so that they may but separate the Son from the Father, and may call Him a creature, and not the proper Word of the Father. To them then must be said what was said to Simon Magus: the impiety of Valentinus *perish with you;* and let everyone rather trust to Solomon, who says, that the Word is Wisdom and Judgment. For he says, *The Lord by Wisdom hath founded the earth, by Judgment hath He established the heavens.* And as here by Judgment, so in the Psalms, *By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made.* And as by the Word the heavens, so *He hath made whatsoever pleased Him.* And as the

[8] Vid. συμβεβηκός.

Apostle writes to the Thessalonians, *the will of God is in Christ Jesus.* Ed. Ben. iii. § 64–66.

54. The Son of God then, He is the *Word* and the *Wisdom*, He the *Judgment* and the Living *Will;* and in Him is the *Good pleasure of the Father;* He is *Truth* and *Light* and *Power* of the Father. But if the Will of God is Wisdom and Judgment, and the Son is Wisdom, he who says that the Son is "by will," says virtually that Wisdom has come into being in Wisdom, and the Son is made in the Son, and the Word created through the Word; which is incompatible with our idea of God and is opposed to His Scriptures. For the Apostle proclaims the Son to be the proper Radiance and Impress, not of the Father's will, but of His Substance Itself, saying, *Who being the Radiance of His Glory and the Impress of His Subsistence.* But if, as we have said before, the Father's Substance and Subsistence be not from will, neither, as is very plain, is what belongs to the Father's Subsistence from will; for such as, and so as, that Blessed Subsistence, must also be the proper Offspring from It. And accordingly the Father Himself said not, "This is The Son, brought into being at My will," nor "the Son whom I have by My favour," but simply *My Son*, or rather, *in whom I am well pleased*, meaning by this, "This is the Son by nature;" and "in Him is lodged My will about those things which please Me."

55. Now we come to the alternative in the interrogation which they put to us. "Since then the Son is by nature and not by will, is He without the good-pleasure of the Father and not with the Father's will?" No, verily; but the Son is with the pleasure of the Father, and, as He says Himself, *The Father loveth the Son, and showeth Him all things.* For as not "from will" did the Father begin to be good, nor yet is good without will and pleasure, (for what He is, that also is His pleasure,) so also that the Son

CHAP. IX. should exist, though it came not "from will," yet it is not without His pleasure or against His purpose. For as His own Subsistence is with His pleasure, so also the Son, as belonging to His Substance, is not without His pleasure. Be then the Son the object of the Father's pleasure and love; and thus let every one piously account of the good-pleasure and the not unwillingness of God. For by that same good-pleasure wherewith the Son is the object of the Father's pleasure, is the Father the object of the Son's love, pleasure, and honour; and one is the good-pleasure which is from the Father into the Son, so that here too we may contemplate the Son in the Father and the Father in the Son.

56. Let no one then, with Valentinus, introduce a precedent will; nor let any one, by this pretence of "counsel" intrude between the Only Father and the Only Word; for it were madness to place will and deliberation between them. For it is one thing to say, "Of will He came to be," and another, that the Father has love and good-pleasure towards His Son who belongs to Him by nature. For to say, "Of will He came to be," in the first place implies that "once He was not;" and next it implies an inclination two ways, as has been said, so that one might be at liberty to entertain the thought, that the Father had the powers even of not willing the Son. But to say of the Son, "He might not have been," is an impious presumption, reaching even to the Substance of the Father, as if what belongs to Him might not have been. For it is the same as saying, "The Father might not have been good." And as the Father is good always and by nature, so He is always generative by nature; and to say, "The Father wills the Son," and "The Word wills the Father," implies, not a precedent will, but genuineness of nature, and propriety and likeness of Substance. For as in the case of the radiance and light one might say, that there is

no will preceding radiance in the light, but it is its natural offspring, at the pleasure of the light which begat it, not by will and consideration, but in nature and truth, so also in the instance of the Father and the Son, it would be orthodox to say, that the Father loves and wills the Son, and the Son loves and wills the Father. Ed. Ben. iii. § 66—67.

57. To conclude then, call not the Son a work of good pleasure, nor bring in the doctrine of Valentinus into the Church; but let Him be the Living Will, and Offspring in truth and nature, as the Radiance from the Light. For thus has the Father spoken, *My heart has burst with a good Word;* and the Son conformably, *I in the Father and the Father in Me.* But if the Word be in the Father's heart, where is will? and if the Son in the Father, where is good-pleasure? and if He be Will Himself, how is Will in Will? it is extravagant; else the Word comes into being in a word, and the Son in a Son, and Wisdom in a wisdom, as has been repeatedly said. For the Son is the Father's All; and nothing was in the Father before the Word; but in the Word is Will also, and through Him the subjects of will are carried out into effect, as holy Scriptures have shown. And I could wish that the impious men, who have so far wandered from reason as to be inquiring about will, as they used to ask their child-bearing women, "Hadst thou a son before conceiving him?" would instead ask the fathers, "Do ye become fathers by an arbitrary act of will, or because to will is natural to you?" and "Are your children like your nature and substance?" For they will reply to them, "What we beget, is like, not our good pleasure, but like ourselves; nor become we parents simply by first willing it, but to beget is proper to our nature; since we too are images of our fathers." Either then let them condemn themselves, and cease asking women about the Son of God, or let them learn from them, that the Son is begotten not by will, but

CHAP. IX. in nature and truth. Becoming and suitable to them is a refutation from human instances, since the perverse-minded men themselves dispute in a human way concerning the Godhead.

58. Truth is loving unto men, and cries continually, "If because of My bodily clothing ye believe Me not, yet believe the works, that ye may know that *I am in the Father and the Father in Me*, and *I and the Father are one*, and *he that hath seen Me hath seen the Father*. But the Lord according to His wont is loving to man, and would fain *help them that are fallen*, as the Psalms of David speak; but the impious men, unwilling to hear the Lord's voice, nor bearing to see Him acknowledged by all as God and God's Son, go about in swarms, miserable as they are, seeking with their father the devil pretexts for their impiety. What pretexts then, and whence, will they be able to find next? unless they borrow blasphemies from Jews and Caiaphas, and take Atheism from Gentiles? for the divine Scriptures are closed to them, and from every part of them they are convicted of being insensate and Christ's enemies.

CHAPTER X.

Answer to intellectual objections.

59. THESE considerations encourage the faithful, and annoy the heretical, perceiving, as they do, that their heresy is suffering defeat thereby. Moreover, their further question "whether the Ingenerate be one or two," shows how heterodox are their thoughts, how treacherous and full of guile. Not for the Father's honour ask they this, but for the dishonour of the Word. Accordingly, should any one, not aware of their craft, answer, "the

Ingenerate is one," forthwith they spirt out their own venom, saying, "Therefore the Son is among things created, and well have we said, He was not before His generation." Thus they are ready to make all kinds of disturbance and confusion, provided they can but separate the Son from the Father, and reckon the Framer of all among His own works. Now first they may be convicted on this score, that, while blaming the Nicene Bishops for their use of phrases not in Scripture, though these were not injurious, but for the subversion of their impiety, they went over to that very tactic themselves, that is, using words not in Scripture, and, that in contumely of the Lord, knowing *neither what they say nor whereof they affirm.* For instance, let them ask the Greeks on the subject, who have been their instructors, (for Ingenerate is a word of Greek invention, not of Scripture,) and when they have been instructed in its various significations, then they will discover that they cannot even argue properly on the subject which they have undertaken. For they have led me to ascertain four senses of the word:[9] first, that by "ingenerate" is meant what has not yet come to be, but is possible to be, as wood which has not yet become, but is capable of becoming, a vessel. Secondly, the term signifies what neither has nor ever can come to be, as a triangle that is quadrangular, and an even number

ED. BEN. I. § 30.

[9] The two first senses here given answer to the two first mentioned, supr. p. 50, and, as he there says, are plainly irrelevant. The third there given, which, as he there observes, is ambiguous and used for a sophistical purpose, is here divided into third and fourth, answering to the two senses which alone are assigned in supr. p. 53, and on them the question turns. This is an instance, of which many occur, how Athan. used his former writings and worked over again his former ground, and simplified or cleared what he had said. In Decr. Nic. supr. p. 50 (A.D. 350) we have three senses of ἀγέννητον, two irrelevant and the third ambiguous; here (A.D. 358) he divides the third into two; in Arim. (A.D. 359) he rejects and omits the two first, leaving the two last, which are the critical senses.

CHAP. X. that is odd. Thirdly, by "ingenerate" is meant, what exists, but not generated from any, nor having a father at all. Lastly, Asterius, that unprincipled sophist, the patron too of this heresy, has added in his own treatise, that what is not made, but is ever, is "ingenerate." They ought then, when they ask the question, to add in what sense they take the word "ingenerate," and then the parties questioned would be able to answer to the point.

60. But if still they think it fair merely to ask, "Is the Ingenerate one or two?" they must be told first of all, as ill-educated men, that many are such and nothing is such; very many things which admit of an origin, and nothing not admitting, as has been said. But if they ask, according to Asterius's meaning of the term, "that which is not a work, but was from eternity," they must be told again and again, that the Son as well as the Father is in this sense ingenerate. For He is neither in the number of things made, nor a work, but has ever been with the Father, as has already been shown, in spite of their much shuffling for the sole sake of insulting the Lord with, "He is of nothing," and "He was not before His generation." When then, after failing at every turn, they betake themselves to asking the question in the other sense of "existing, but not generated of any, nor having a father," then we shall tell them that the Ingenerate in this sense is only one, namely, the Father; and they will gain nothing by their question. For to say that God is in this sense Ingenerate, does not show that the Son is a thing made, it being evident from the above proofs that the Word is such as He is who begat Him. Therefore if God be ingenerate, His Image is not made, but an Offspring, namely, His Word and His Wisdom. For what likeness has the made to the Ingenerate? (one must not weary to use repetition); for if they will have it that the one is like

the other, so that he who sees the one beholds the other, they are not far from saying that the Ingenerate is the image of creatures; the end of which is a confusion of the whole subject, an equalling of things made with the Ingenerate, and a denial of the Ingenerate by measuring Him with the works; and all in order to reduce the Son into their number. Ed. Ben. i. § 30–32.

61. However, I suppose even they will be unwilling to proceed to such lengths, that is, if they follow Asterius the sophist. For he, earnest as he is in his advocacy of the Arian heresy, and maintaining that the Ingenerate is one, runs counter to them in saying also, that the Wisdom of God is ingenerate and unoriginate; the following is a passage out of his work: "The Blessed Paul said not that he preached Christ the power of God or the wisdom of God, but, without the article, *a power of God and a wisdom of God;* thus preaching that the proper power of God Himself, which is natural to Him and co-existent with Him ingenerately, is something besides." And, again soon after: "However, His eternal power and wisdom, which truth argues to be unoriginate and ingenerate, this must surely be one." For though misunderstanding the Apostle's words, he considered that there were two wisdoms; yet by speaking still of an ingenerate wisdom co-existent with Him, he declares that the Ingenerate is not simply one, but that there is another ingenerate with Him. For what is co-existent co-exists not with itself, but with another. If then they agree with Asterius, let them never ask again, "Is the Ingenerate one or two," or they will have to contest the point with him; if, on the other hand, they differ even from him, let them not rest their defence upon his treatise, lest, *biting one another, they be consumed one of another.*

62. So much on the point of their ignorance; but who can say enough on their wicked purpose? who but would

CHAP. X. justly hate them while possessed by such a madness? for when they were no longer free to say, "out of nothing," and "He was not before His generation," they hit upon this word "Ingenerate," that by saying among the simple that the Son was generate, that is, came to be, they might imply the very same phrases "out of nothing," and "He once was not;" for in such phrases things made and creatures are implied. If they have confidence in their own positions, they should stand to them, and not change about so variously; but this they will not do, from an idea that success is altogether easy, if they do but shelter their heresy under colour of the word "ingenerate." Yet after all, this term is not used in contrast with the Son, clamour as they may, but with things made; and the like may be found in the words "Almighty" and "Lord of the Powers."[1] For if we say that the Father has power and lordship over all things by the Word, and the Son rules the Father's kingdom, and has the power of all, as His Word, and as the Image of the Father, it is quite plain that neither in this respect is the Son reckoned among that all, nor is God called Almighty and Lord with reference to Him, but to those things which through the Son come to be, and over which He exercises power and lordship through the Word. And therefore the Ingenerate is understood, not by contrast with the Son but with the things which through the Son come to be. And excellently: since God is not such as things that come to be, but

[1] The passage which follows is written with his de Decr. before him. At first he but uses the same topics, but presently he incorporates into this Discourse an actual portion of his former work, with only such alterations as an author commonly makes in transcribing. This, which is not unfrequent with Athan., shows us the care with which he made his doctrinal statements, though they seem at first sight written off. It also accounts for the diffuseness and repetition which might be imputed to his composition, what seems superfluous being often only the insertion of an extract from a former work.

is their Creator and Framer through the Son. And as the word "Ingenerate" signifies a relation to things created, so the word "Father" is indicative of the Son. And he who names God Maker and Framer and Ingenerate, regards and apprehends things that are created and come to be; and he who calls God Father, thereby conceives and contemplates the Son. And hence one might marvel at the obstinacy which is added to their impiety, that, whereas the term "Ingenerate" has the aforesaid good meaning, and admits of being piously used, they, in their private heresy, bring it forth for the dishonour of the Son, not having read that he who honoureth the Son honoureth the Father, and he dishonoureth the Father who dishonoureth the Son. If they had any concern at all for reverent speaking and for the honour due to the Father, it became them rather, and this were better and higher, to acknowledge and call God Father, than to give Him this name. For, in calling God ingenerate, they are, as I said before, naming Him from His works, and as Maker only and Framer, supposing that hence they may imply that the Word is a work to their own private satisfaction. But he who calls God Father, names Him from the Son, being well aware that since there is a Son, of necessity through that Son all things that have come into being were created. And they, when they call Him Ingenerate, name Him only from His works, and know not the Son any more than the Greeks. But he who calls God Father, names Him from the Word; and knowing the Word, he acknowledges Him to be Framer of all, and understands that through Him all things were made. ED. BEN. i. § 33—34.

63. Therefore it is more pious and more accurate to denote God from the Son and call Him Father, than to name Him from His works only and call Him Ingenerate. For the latter title, as I have said, does nothing more than

CHAP. X. refer to all the works, individually and collectively, which have come into being at the will of God through the Word; but the title Father, has its significance and its bearing only from the Son. And, whereas the Word surpasses things that have a beginning, by so much and more doth calling God Father surpass the calling Him Ingenerate. For the latter is unscriptural, and suspicious, as having various senses; so that when a man is asked concerning it, his mind is carried about to many ideas; but the word Father is simple and scriptural, and more accurate, and distinctly implies the Son. And "Ingenerate" is a word of the Greeks, who know not the Son; but "Father" has been acknowledged and vouchsafed by our Lord. For He, knowing Himself whose Son He was, said, *I am in the Father, and the Father is in Me;* and, *He that hath seen Me, hath seen the Father*, and *I and the Father are One;* but nowhere is He found to call the Father Ingenerate. Moreover, when He teaches us to pray, He says not, "When ye pray, say, O God Ingenerate," but rather, *When ye pray, say, Our Father, who art in heaven.* And it was His will that the summary of our faith should have the same force in bidding us be baptised, not into the name of Ingenerate and generate, nor into the name of Creator and creature, but into the Name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. For with such an initiation we, too, being of the works, are henceforth made sons, and using the name of the Father, acknowledge also from that Name the Word in the Father Himself. A vain thing then is their argument about the term "Ingenerate," as is now proved, and nothing more than a fantasy.

Chapter XI.

Answer to intellectual objections.

64. As to their question whether the Word is mutable,[2] it is superfluous to examine it; it is enough simply to write down what they say, in order to show its daring impiety. How they trifle, appears from the following questions:—"Has He free will, or has He not? is He good from purpose according to free will, and can He, if He will, alter, being of an alterable nature? or, as wood or stone, has He no purpose of His own, free to be moved hither and thither?" It is but agreeable to their heresy thus to speak and think; for when once they have framed to themselves a God out of nothing and a created Son, of course they also adopt such terms as are suitable to the idea of a creature. However, when in their controversies with authorities of the Church they hear from them of the real and only Word of the Father, and yet venture thus to speak of Him, does not their doctrine then become the most loathsome that can be found? Is it not enough to shock a man on mere hearing, though unable to reply, and to make him stop his ears, from astonishment at the novelty of what he hears them say, which even to utter is to blaspheme? For if the Word be mutable and alterable, where will He stay, and what will be the issue of His progress? how shall the mutable possibly be like the Immutable? How should he who has seen the mutable, be considered to have seen the Immutable? in which of His states shall we be able to behold in Him the Father? for it is plain that not at all

Ed. Ben. i. § 34—35.

[2] τρεπτὸς, not, changeable, but of a moral nature capable of improvement or the reverse. Arius maintained this in the strongest terms at starting. "On being asked whether the Word of God is capable of altering as the devil altered, they scrupled not to say. 'Yea, He is capable.'" Alex. ap, Socr. i. 6, p. 11.

CHAP. XI. times shall we see the Father in the Son, because the Son is ever altering, and is of a changing nature. For the Father is unalterable and unchangeable, and is always in the same state and always the same; but if, as they hold, the Son is alterable, and not always the same, but ever of a changing nature, how can such a one be the Father's Image, not having the likeness of His unalterableness? how can He be in the Father at all, if His moral choice is indeterminate? Nay, perhaps, as being alterable, and advancing daily, He is not perfect yet. But away with such madness of the Arians, and let the Truth shine out, and show that they are beside themselves. For must not He be perfect who is equal to God? and must not He be unalterable, who is one with the Father, and is His Son proper to His substance? and the Father's substance being unalterable, unalterable must be also the proper Offspring from it. And if nevertheless they blasphemously impute alteration to the Word, let them learn how much their own reason is in peril; for from the fruit is the tree known. For this is why he who hath seen the Son, hath seen the Father, and why the knowledge of the Son is knowledge of the Father.

65. Therefore the image of the immutable God must be unalterable; for *Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.* And David in the Psalm says of Him, *Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of Thine hands. They shall perish, but Thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment. And as a vesture shalt Thou fold them up, and they shall be changed, but Thou art the same, and Thy years shall not fail.* And the Lord Himself says of Himself through the Prophet, *See now that I, even I, am He, and I vary not.* For, though it may be said tha the Father is signified in these passages, yet it suits the Son also to speak them,[3] specially because, after becoming

[3] Vid. supr. p. 6.

man, he manifests His own identity and unalterableness to any who think that by reason of the flesh He has been changed and become other than He was. More trustworthy are the sacred writers, or rather the Lord, than the perversity of the impious. For Scripture, as in the above-cited reading of the Psalter, signifying under the name of heaven and earth, that the nature of all things that come to be, and the whole creation, is alterable, and changeable, yet by excepting the Son from these, shows us thereby that He is in nowise one who had a beginning; nay teaches that He changes everything else, and is Himself not changed, in saying, *Thou art the same, and Thy years shall not fail.* Ed. Ben. I. § 35—36.

66. And with reason; for things made, being from nothing, and not existing before their making, have a nature which is changeable; but the Son, being from the Father, and proper to His substance, is unchangeable and unalterable as the Father Himself. For it were sin to say that from that substance which is unalterable was begotten an alterable word and a changeable wisdom. For how is He longer the Word, if He be alterable? or can that be Wisdom which is changeable? unless forsooth, as accident is in substance,[4] so these would be in God; viz., as in any particular substance a certain grace and habit of virtue exists accidentally, which is called Word and Son and Wisdom, and admits of being taken from that substance or added to it. For they have often expressed this sentiment, but it is not the faith of Christians; as not declaring that there is truly a Word and Son of God, or that the wisdom spoken of is the true Wisdom. For what alters and changes, and has no stay in one and the same condition, how can that be true? whereas the Lord says, *I am the Truth.* If then the Lord Himself speaks thus concerning Himself, and declares His unalterableness, and the sacred

[4] Vid. supr. p. 200. Also App. *συμβεβηκός.*

CHAP. XII. writers have learned and testify this, nay, and our notion of God approve of it as pious, whence did these men of impiety draw this novelty? from their heart, as from a seat of corruption, did they vomit it forth.

CHAPTER XII.

Answer to objections from Scripture; first, Phil. ii. 9, 10.

67. So much on objections to the sacred truth, arising out of the doctrine itself; now I go on to speak of the Scripture announcements about it, that is, viewing them not according to the perverseness of Arian heresy, but in that true sense which the Church has ever maintained.[5] They say then, that the Apostle writes,—

Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a Name which is above every name; that at the Name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things in earth and things under the earth: and David,

Wherefore God, even Thy God, hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows.

Then they urge, as something acute: "If He was exalted and received grace, on a *wherefore*, and on a *wherefore* was anointed, He received the reward of His good choice; but having acted from choice, He is altogether of a mutable nature." This is what Eusebius and Arius have dared to say, nay, to write; while their partisans do not shrink from conversing about it in full market, not seeing how mad an argument they use. For if He received what He had as a reward of His good choice, and would not have had it, unless He had needed it and had His work to

[5] ἐκδικῆσαι. It is observable that Athan. does not deny that Scripture can be read wrongly (as if it always spoke for itself, and carried with it its own interpretation), but only says it admits of an orthodox sense. Vid. ὀρθός, &c.

show for it, then having gained it from virtue and growth in good, certainly it was possible for such a being "therefore" to be Son and God, without being a real Son. For what is from another by nature, is a real offspring, as Isaac was to Abraham, and Joseph to Jacob, and the radiance to the sun; but the so-called sons from virtue and grace, have in place of nature only a grace by acquisition, and are something else besides the gift itself; as the men who have received the Spirit by participation, concerning whom Scripture saith, *I have begotten and exalted children, and they have rebelled against Me.* And of course since they were not sons by nature, therefore, when they changed, the Spirit was taken away from them and they were disinherited; and again on their repentance that God who thus at the beginning gave them grace, will receive them and give light, and call them sons again. This is how they speak, and it is all very clear and plain when said of those whose sonship is not natural but adoptive: but do they go so far as to maintain that such is the sense in which our Lord Jesus is the Son of God? If so, then doubtless He is neither very God nor very Son, nor like the Father, nor in anywise has He God as Father of His being according to substance, but as Father of the mere grace given to Him, and as Creator of His being, according to substance, after the similitude of all others. And being such, if this is their view, it will be manifest further that He had not the name "Son" from the first, but it was the prize of works done and of an advancement in virtue, at the time when He became man and took the form of servant; and after becoming *obedient unto death*, He was *highly* exalted, and received that Name as a grace, at which *every knee should bow.* Ed. Ben i. § 37—38.

68. This line of thought is very clear, but perhaps it will be found to go somewhat further than these men would wish. For, let me ask them, supposing He was then exalted and

CHAP. XII. then began to be worshipped, and then was first called Son, what was He before His incarnation? Have they made up their minds on this point? I repeat, what was He before this? One must urge the question on them again, to make it understood what their impiety results in. For if the Lord be God, Son, Word, yet was not all these before He became man, then either He was something else besides these, and afterwards became partaker of these for His virtue's sake, as we have said, or they must of necessity adopt the alternative (may it fall upon their heads!) that He did not exist before that time, but is wholly man by nature, and nothing more. Are they content with such an issue of their reasoning? Why, it is the very sentiment of Samosatene and of the present Jews; it is no teaching of the Church. If this be their mind, wherefore, as being Jews, are they not circumcised with them too, instead of pretending Christianity, while they are its foes? For if He did not pre-exist, or did indeed, but afterwards was advanced, how were all things made by Him, or how, if He were not perfect, did the Father delight in Him? And He, on the other hand, if now advanced in good, how did He before that rejoice in the presence of the Father? And, if it was after His death that He received His worship, how is Abraham seen to worship Him in the tent, and Moses in the bush? and how, as Daniel saw, were myriads of myriads, and thousands of thousands, ministering unto Him?[6] And if, as they say, He had His advancement only now, how did the Son Himself make mention of that His glory before and above the world, when He said, *Glorify Thou Me, O Father, with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was.* If, as they say, it was now that He was exalted, how did He before that *bow the heavens and come down;* and again, *the Highest gave His voice?* There-

[6] All this implies a traditional and authoritative interpretation of the books of the Old Testament.

fore, if, even before the world was made, the Son had that glory, and was Lord of glory and the Highest, and descended from heaven, and is ever to be worshipped, it follows that He had no advance in greatness in consequence of His descent, but rather by that descent Himself bettered the things which needed bettering; and if He descended in order to their bettering, therefore He did not receive in reward the name of Son and God, but rather He Himself has made us sons of the Father, and made men gods, by Himself becoming man. Ed. Ben. i. § 38—39.

69. Before going on, then, to explain the passages of Scripture objected to us, I think so far is clear, that at least the Arian sense is quite incompatible with what the Lord has told us of Himself, as God and Son of God, of His descent from heaven, and the reason of it. He was not first man and then became God, but He was God and then became man, and that in order to make us gods. Otherwise, if only when He became man, He was called Son and God, yet before He became man, God called the ancient people sons, and made Moses a god to Pharaoh (and Scripture says of an assembly, *God standeth in the congregation of gods*), it is plain that He is called Son and God later than they. How then are all things through Him, and He before all? or how is He *first-born of the whole creation*, if He has others before Him who are called sons and gods? And how is it that those first partakers of the gift do not partake of the Word? This opinion is not true; it is a discovery of our Judaisers. For how in that case can any at all know God as their Father? for adoption there cannot be apart from the real Son, who says, *No one knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him.* And how can there be deifying apart from the Word and before Him? yet, saith He to the brethren of these men, the Jews, *If He called them gods, unto whom the Word of God came.* And if all that are called sons and gods, whether in earth

CHAP. XII.

or in heaven, were adopted and deified through the Word, and the Son Himself is the Word, it is plain that through Him are they all, and He Himself before all, or rather He Himself only is very Son, and He alone is very God from the very God, not receiving these prerogatives as a reward for His virtue, nor being something else beside them, but being all these by nature and according to substance. For He is Offspring of the Father's substance, so that one cannot doubt that after the resemblance of the unalterable Father, the Word also is unalterable.

70. Hitherto we have met their irrational conceits with the true conceptions implied in the word "Son," as the Lord Himself has enabled us, and confining ourselves to them. But it will be well next to expound the inspired passages in question, that the unalterableness of the Son and His unchangeable nature, which is the Father's, as well as their perverseness, may be still more fully proved. The Apostle then, writing to the Philippians, says, *Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus; who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men. And, being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient to death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a Name which is above every name; that at the Name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.* Can anything be plainer and more express than this? He was not from a lower state advanced; but rather, existing as God, He took the form of a servant, and in taking it did not advance Himself in dignity but humbled Himself. Where then is there here any reward of virtue, or what advancement and promotion in humilia-

tion? For if, being God, He became man, and, after descending from on high, is said to be exalted, where is He exalted, being God?—this withal being plain, that since God is highest of all, His Word must necessarily be highest also. Whither then could He be exalted higher, who is in the Father and is like the Father in all things? Ed. Ben. i. § 39—41.

71. Therefore He is beyond the need of any addition; and not such as the Arians think Him. For though the Word did descend in order to be exalted, and so it is written, yet what need was there that He should humble Himself at all, as if to seek that which He had already? And what grace did He receive who is the Giver of grace? or how did He receive that Name for worship, who is always worshipped by His Name? Nay, certainly before He became man, the sacred writers invoke Him, *Save me, O God, for Thy Name's sake;* and again, *Some put their trust in chariots, and some in horses, but we will remember the Name of the Lord our God.* And while He was worshipped by the Patriarchs, concerning the Angels it is written, *Let all the Angels of God worship Him.* And if, as David says in the 71st Psalm, *His Name remaineth before the sun, and before the moon from one generation to another*, how did He receive what He had always, even before He now received it? or how is He exalted, being, even before His exaltation, the Most High? or how did He receive the right of being worshipped, who was ever worshipped before He became man?

72. This doctrine is not a human riddle, but a divine mystery. *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God;* but for our sakes afterwards *the Word was made flesh.* And the term in question, *highly exalted*, does not signify that the substance of the Word was exalted, for He was ever and is *equal to God*, but the exaltation is of the manhood. Accordingly, this is not said before the Word became flesh; that it might be plain

CHAP. XII. that *humbled* and *exalted* are spoken of His humanity; for where there is humble estate, there too may be exaltation; and if because of His taking flesh "*humbled*" is written, it is clear that "*highly exalted*" is also said because of that incarnation. For of this was man's nature in want, because of the degradation of the flesh and of death. Since then the Word, being the Image of the Father and immortal, *took the form of a servant*, and as man underwent for us death in His own flesh, that thereby He might offer Himself for us through death to the Father; therefore, also, as man, He is said because of us and for us to be highly exalted, that as by His death we all died in Christ, so again in Christ Himself we might be highly exalted, being raised from the dead, and ascending into heaven, *whither the Forerunner is for us entered, not into the figures of the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.* But if now for us the Christ is entered into heaven itself, though He was even before and always Lord and Framer of the heavens, for us therefore is that present exaltation also written. And as He Himself, while sanctifying all, says also that He sanctifies Himself to the Father for our sakes, not that the Word may become holy, but that He Himself may in Himself sanctify all of us, in like manner we must take the present phrase, *He highly exalted Him*, not that He Himself should be exalted, for He is the highest, but that He may become righteousness for us, and that we may be exalted in Him, and that we may enter the gates of heaven, which He has also opened for us, they saying who run before, *Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of Glory shall come in.* For here, also, not on Him were shut the gates, who is Lord and Maker of all, but because of us it is written, to whom the door of paradise was shut. And therefore in a human relation, because of the flesh which He bore, it is said of Him, *Lift up, O ye gates*, and *shall*

come in, as if a man were entering; but in a divine relation on the other hand it is said of Him, ——— since *the Word was God*, that He is the *Lord* and the *King of glory*. Such an exaltation, as fulfilled in us, the Spirit fore-announced in the eighty-eighth Psalm, saying, *And in Thy righteousness shall they be exalted, for Thou art the glory of their strength*. And if the Son be Righteousness, then He is not exalted as being Himself in need, but it is we who are exalted in that Righteousness, which is He. Ed. Ben. i. § 41—42.

73. And so too the words *gave Him* are not written for the Word Himself; for even before He became man, He was worshipped, as we have said, by the Angels and by the whole creation, as having the prerogative of the Father; but because of us and for us this too is written of Him. For as Christ died and was exalted as man, so, as man, is He said to take what, as God, He ever had, that even this so high a grant of grace might reach to us. For the Word was not impaired in receiving a body, that He should seek to receive a grace, but rather He deified that which He put on, nay, *gave* it graciously to the race of man. For as He was ever worshipped as being the Word and *existing in the form of God*, so, being what He ever was, though become man and called Jesus, He still has, as before, the whole creation under foot, and bending their knees to Him in this Name, and confessing that the Word's becoming flesh, and undergoing death in flesh, hath not happened against the glory of His Godhead, but *to the glory of God the Father*. For it is the Father's glory that man, made and then lost, should be found again; and when done to death, that He should be made alive, and should become God's temple. For whereas the powers in heaven, both Angels and Archangels, were ever worshipping the Lord, as they are now worshipping Him in the Name of Jesus, this is our grace and high exaltation, that even when He became man, the Son of God is worshipped, and the heavenly powers are

CHAP. XII. not startled at seeing all of us, who are of one body with Him, introduced into their realms. And this had not been, unless He who existed in the form of God had taken on Him a servant's form, and had humbled Himself, yielding His body even unto death.

74. Behold then the *foolishness of God*, as men consider it because of the Cross, has become of all things most honoured. For our resurrection is stored up in it; and no longer Israel alone, but henceforth all the nations, as the Prophet foretold, are leaving their idols and acknowledging the true God, the Father of the Christ. And the delusion of demons is come to nought, and He only who is really God is worshipped in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ. For that the Lord, incarnate and with the Name of Jesus, is worshipped as God's Son, and the Father known through Him, is a plain proof, as has been said, that not the Word, considered as the Word, received this so great grace, but that it was we. For, because of our relationship to His Body, we too have become God's temple, and in consequence are made God's sons, so that even in us the Lord is now worshipped, and beholders report, as the Apostle says, that *God is in them of a truth*. As also John saith in the Gospel, *As many as received Him, to them gave He power to become children of God;* and in his Epistle he writes, *By this we know that He abideth in us, by His Spirit which He hath given us*. And this too is an evidence of His goodness towards us, that, while we were exalted because the Highest Lord is in us, and for our sake grace was given to Him, (because the Lord from whom it comes had become a man like us,) He on the other hand, the Saviour, humbled Himself in taking *our body of humiliation*, and took a servant's form, putting on that flesh which was enslaved to sin. And He indeed gained nothing from us for His own advancement: for the Word of God is without want and full; but rather it was we who were advanced

from Him; for He is the *Light, which lighteneth every man that cometh into the world.* Ed. Ben. I. § 43—44.

75. In vain then do the Arians lay stress upon the conjunction *wherefore*, in consequence of Paul having said, *Wherefore hath God highly exalted Him.* For in saying this he did not imply His resurrection was any prize of virtue, or advancement for the better, but he assigned the cause why the exaltation was bestowed upon us. And what is this but that He who existed in form of God, the Son of a divine Father, humbled Himself and became a servant instead of us and in our behalf? For if the Lord had not become man, we had not been redeemed from sins, nor raised from the dead, but had remained dead under the earth; not exalted into heaven, but lying in Hades. Because of us then and in our behalf are the words, *highly exalted* and *given.*

76. This then I consider the meaning of this passage, and that especially in harmony with the sentiment of the Church. However, there is another way of handling it, not divergent but parallel; viz., that, though it does not speak of the exaltation of the Word Himself, considered as Word (for He is, as was just now said, most high and like His Father), yet by reason of His incarnation, the passage speaks of His resurrection from the dead. For after saying, *He hath humbled Himself even unto death*, the passage immediately adds, *Wherefore He hath highly exalted Him;* wishing to show, that, although as man it is recorded of Him that He died, yet, as being Life, He was exalted in the resurrection; for *He who descended, is the same also who rose again.* This then is the second sense of "wherefore," in the passage; the Lord's exaltation was, I have said, in order to ours; but further, it was the necessary result of the divinity which, even as regards the body, death could not detain. He descended in a body, and He rose again because it was God who was in that body. And this I say is the

CHAP. XII. reason, according to this interpretation, why He brought in the conjunction *Wherefore;* not to signify a reward of virtue nor an advancement, but the direct cause why the resurrection took place; and why, while all other men from Adam down to this time have died and remained dead, He only in integrity of being rose from the dead. The cause is this, which He Himself has already taught us, that He was God, who afterwards became man. For all other men, being merely born of Adam, died, and death reigned over them; but He, the Second Man, is from heaven, for *the Word was made flesh*, and such a Man is said to be from heaven and heavenly, because the Word descended from heaven; wherefore He was not held under death. For though He humbled Himself, allowing His own Body even to die, in that it was capable of death, yet it was without delay exalted from earth, because He was also God's Son in a body. Accordingly what is here said, *Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him*, answers to St. Peter's words in the Acts, *Whom God raised up, having loosed the bonds of death, because it was not possible that He should be holden of it.* For while Paul has written, "Whereas being in form of God He became man, and humbled Himself unto death, therefore God also hath highly exalted Him," so also Peter says, "Whereas, being God, He became man, and by signs and wonders was proved to eye-witnesses to be God, therefore it was not possible that He should be holden of death." To man it had *not* been possible to succeed in such a matter; for death is proper to man; wherefore the Word, being God, became flesh, that, being put to death in the flesh, He might quicken all men by His own power.

77. Here I must add one word in explanation. Since the Word is said to be exalted and to receive gifts from God, heretics think this must necessarily affect or impair the substance of the Word, but this is not so. He is said to be exalted from the lower parts of the earth, because death

also is ascribed to Him. Both events are reckoned His, since it was His Body, and none other's, that was exalted from the dead and taken up into heaven. And again, the body being His, and the Word not being external to it, it is natural that when the Body was exalted, He, as man, should, because of the body, be spoken of as exalted. If then He did not become man, let this not be said of Him; but if *the Word became flesh*, of necessity the resurrection and exaltation, as when a man is spoken of, must be ascribed to Him, in order that the death which is ascribed to Him may be a redemption of the sins of men and an abolition of death, and that the resurrection and exaltation may for His sake remain secure for us. And both phrases run, *God hath highly exalted Him*, and *God hath given to Him*, in order to show that it is not the Father that hath become flesh, but it is His Word, who has become man and after the manner of men has received gifts from the Father, and is exalted by Him, as has been said. And it is plain, nor would any one dispute it, that what the Father gives, He gives through the Son. And it is marvellous and overwhelming verily, that the grace which the Son gives from the Father, that the Son Himself is said to receive; and that the exaltation, which the Son effects from the Father, with that the Son is Himself exalted. For He who is the Son of God, He Himself became the Son of Man; and, as Word, He gives what comes from the Father, for all things which the Father does and gives, He does and supplies through Him; and as being the Son of Man, He Himself is said, after the manner of men, to receive what proceeds from Himself, because His Body is none other than His, and is a natural recipient of grace, as has been said. For He received it as far as man's nature was exalted; which exaltation was its being deified. But such an exaltation the Word Himself always had according to the Father's Godhead and perfection, which was His.

ED. BEN. i. § 44—45.

Chapter XIII.

Answer to objections from Scripture; secondly, Psalm xliv. 7.

Chap. XIII. 78. Such an explanation of the Apostle's words ——— confutes the impious men; and what the Psalmist says admits also the same orthodox sense, which they misinterpret, but which in the Psalmist is manifestly according to piety. He says then, *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of Thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity, wherefore God, even Thy God, hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows.* Behold, O ye Arians, and acknowledge even hence the truth. The Psalmist speaks of us all as *fellows* or *partakers* of the Lord; but were He one of things which come out of nothing and of things made partakers, He Himself had been one of those who partake. But, since he sang of Him as the eternal God, saying, *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever*, and has declared that all other things partake of Him, what conclusion must we draw, but that He is distinct from created things, and He only the Father's veritable Word, Radiance, and Wisdom, which all things made partake, being sanctified by Him in the Spirit? And therefore He is here "anointed," not that He may become God, for He was so even before; nor that He may become King, for He had the Kingdom eternally, existing as God's Image, as the sacred Oracle shows; but, as before, in our behalf is this written. For the Israelitish kings, upon their being anointed, then became kings, not being so before, as David, as Ezekias, as Josias, and the rest; but the Saviour on the contrary, being God, and ever ruling over the Father's Kingdom, and being Himself the Dispenser of the Holy Ghost, nevertheless is here said to be anointed, that, as before, being said as man to be anointed with the Spirit, He might provide for us men, not only exaltation and resurrection, but the indwelling and intimacy of the Spirit. And, signifying this,

the Lord Himself hath said by His own mouth, Ed. Ben. I. § 46—47. in the Gospel according to John, *I have sent them into the world, and for their sakes do I sanctify Myself, that they may be sanctified in truth.* In saying this He has shown that He is not the sanctified, but the Sanctifier; for He is not sanctified by other, but He Himself sanctifies Himself, that we may be sanctified in the Truth. He who sanctifies Himself is Lord of sanctification. How then does this take place? What does He mean but this? viz., "I, being the Father's Word, I give to Myself, when become man, the Spirit; and in the same Spirit do I sanctify Myself when become man, that henceforth in Me, who am Truth, (for *Thy Word is Truth*,) all men may be sanctified."

79. If then for our sake He sanctifies Himself, and does this when He has become man, it is also very plain that the Spirit's descent on Him in Jordan, was a descent upon us, because of His bearing our body. And it did not take place for any advancement of the Word, but again for our sanctification, that we might share His anointing, and that of us it might be said, *Know ye not that ye are God's Temple, and the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?* For when the Lord, as man, was washed in Jordan, it was we who were washed in Him and by Him. And when He received the Spirit, we it was who by Him are made capable of receiving It. And moreover for this reason, it was not as Aaron or David or the rest, that He was anointed with oil, but in another way above all His fellows, *with the oil of gladness;* which He Himself interprets to be the Spirit, saying by the Prophet, *The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because the Lord hath anointed Me;* as also the Apostle has said, *How God anointed Him with the Holy Ghost.* When then were these prophecies fulfilled in Him but when on His coming in the flesh He was baptized in Jordan, and the Spirit descended on Him? And indeed the Lord Himself

CHAP. XIII. says to His disciples, *The Spirit shall take of Mine;* and *I will send Him;* and *Receive ye the Holy Ghost;* but notwithstanding, He who, as the Word and Radiance of the Father, gives to others, elsewhere is said to be sanctified, because now He has become man, and the Body that is sanctified is His. From Him then we have begun to receive the unction and the seal, John saying, *And ye have an unction from the Holy One;* and the Apostle, *And ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise.* Therefore because of us and for us are these words.

80. What advance then in goodness, and reward of virtue or generally of conduct, is proved from this in our Lord's instance? For if He was not God, and then had become God, if not being King He was promoted to royalty, your reasoning would have had some faint plausibility. But if He is God and the throne of His kingdom is everlasting, in what way could God advance? or what was there wanting to Him who was sitting on His Father's throne? And if, as the Lord Himself has said, the Spirit is His, and takes of His, and is sent by Him, it is not the Word, considered as the Word and Wisdom, who is anointed with that Spirit which He Himself gives, but the flesh assumed by Him which is anointed in Him and by Him; that the sanctification coming to the Lord as man, may come to all men from Him. For not of Itself, saith He, doth the Spirit speak, but the Word is He who gives It to the worthy. For this is like the passage considered above; for as the Apostle has written, *Who existing in form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but humbled Himself, and took a servant's form,* so David celebrates the Lord, as everlasting God and King, but sent to us and assuming our body which is mortal. For this is his meaning in the Psalm, *All Thy garments smell of myrrh, aloes, and cassia;* and it is represented by Nicodemus and by Mary's company, when he came bringing *a*

mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pounds weight, and they *the spices which they had prepared* for the burial of the Lord's body. Ed. Ben. i. § 47—48.

81. What promotion then was it to the Immortal to have assumed the mortal? or what gain is it to the Everlasting to have put on the temporal? what reward can be great to the Everlasting God and King, being as He is in the bosom of the Father? Perceive ye not, that this too was done and written because of us and for us, that us who are mortal and temporal, the Lord by becoming man might make immortal, and bring into the everlasting kingdom of heaven? Blush ye not, speaking lies against the divine oracles? For, when our Lord Jesus Christ had been among us, we indeed were profited as being rescued from sin; but He is the same: nor did He alter, by becoming man, (to repeat what I have already said,) but, as has been written, *The Word of God abideth for ever.* Surely as, before His becoming man, He, as being the Word, dispensed to the saints the Spirit as His own, so also after He was made man, He sanctifies all by the Spirit, and says to His Disciples, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost.* And He gave It to Moses and to the other seventy; and through Him David prayed to the Father, saying, *Take not Thy Holy Spirit from me.* On the other hand, when made man, He said, *I will send to you the Paraclete, the Spirit of truth;* and He sent Him, He the Word of God, as being faithful to His promise.

82. Therefore, *Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever*, remaining unalterable, and at once gives and receives, giving as God's Word, receiving as man. As He Himself says, *The glory which Thou gavest Me, I have given to them, that they may be one even as We are one.* Because of us then He asked for glory, and the words *took* and *gave* and *highly exalted* occur that we might take, and to us might be given, and we might be exalted in

CHAP. XIII. Him; as also for us He sanctifies Himself that we might be sanctified in Him. For He says not, "Wherefore He anointed Thee in order to Thy being God or King or Son or Word;" for so He was before and is for ever, as has been shown; but rather, "Since Thou art God and King, therefore Thou wast anointed, since none but Thou couldst unite man to the Holy Ghost,—Thou, the Image of the Father, in which we were made in the beginning; for Thine is also the Spirit." For the nature of creatures could give no warranty for this, Angels having transgressed, and men disobeyed. Wherefore there was need of God, and such is the Word, that those who had come under a curse He Himself might set free. If then He was from nothing, He would not have been the Christ or Anointed One, being one among others, and merely partaking gifts with the rest. But, whereas He is God, as being Son of God, and is everlasting King, and exists as Radiance and Impress of the Father, therefore fitly is He the expected Christ, whom the Father announces to mankind by revelation to His holy Prophets; that as through Him we have come into being, so also in Him all men might be redeemed from their sins, and by Him all things might be ruled.

83. It is very plain then why, when the Lord came on earth, there was a necessity that He should not refuse to be called inferior to the Spirit, in respect of His manhood, as He really was. Thus, when the Jews said that He cast out devils in Beelzebub, He answered and said to them, for the exposure of their blasphemy, *But if I through the Spirit of God cast out devils*, &c. Behold, the Giver of the Spirit here says that He cast out devils in the Spirit; but this is not said, except because of His flesh. For since man's nature is not equal of itself to casting out devils, but only in power of the Spirit, therefore as man He said, *But if I through the Spirit of God cast*

out devils. Of course too when He said, *Whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him,* He signified that the blasphemy offered to the Holy Ghost was greater than this against His humanity. Such blasphemy was theirs who said, *Is not this the carpenter's son?* but they who blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, and ascribe the deeds of the Word to the devil, shall have inevitable punishment. This is what the Lord spoke to the Jews, as man; but to the disciples, showing His Godhead and His majesty, and intimating that He was not inferior but equal to the Spirit, He gave the Spirit and said, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost,* and *I send Him,* and *He shall glorify Me,* and *Whatsoever He heareth, that He shall speak.* As then in this place the Lord Himself, the Giver of the Spirit, does not refuse to say that through the Spirit He casts out devils, as man; in like manner He the same, the Giver of the Spirit, refused not to say, *The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He hath anointed Me,* in respect of His having *become flesh,* as John hath said; that it might be shown in both these particulars, that it is we who need the Spirit's grace in our sanctification, and again it is we who are unable to cast out devils without the Spirit's power. Through whom then and from whom behoved it that the Spirit should be given but through the Son, whose also is the Spirit? and when were we enabled to receive It, except when the Word became man? and, as the passage of the Apostle shows that we should not have been redeemed and highly exalted, had not He who exists in form of God taken a servant's form, so David also shows, that not otherwise should we have partaken of the Spirit and been sanctified, save that the Giver of the Spirit, the Word Himself, had spoken of Himself as anointed with the Spirit for us. And therefore did we securely receive It, because He was declared to be anointed in the flesh; for the

CHAP. XIII. flesh being first sanctified in Him, and He being said, as man, to have received the gift in behalf of the flesh, we have after Him the Spirit's grace, receiving *out of His fulness.*

84. Nor do the words, *Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity*, which are added in the Psalm, show, as again you suppose, that the nature of the Word is mutable, but rather by their very force signify His immutability. For since of things made the nature is alterable, and the one portion of creation had transgressed and the other disobeyed, as has been said, and it is not certain how they will act, but it often happens that he who is now good afterwards alters and becomes different, and one who was but now righteous, soon is found unrighteous, therefore there was here also need of One who was unalterable, that men might have the immutability of the righteousness of the Word as an image and type for virtue. And this thought commends itself strongly to the right-minded. For since the first man Adam changed, and through sin death came into the world, therefore it became the second Adam to be unchangeable; that should the Serpent again assault, even the Serpent's deceit might be baffled, and, the Lord being unalterable and unchangeable, the Serpent might become powerless in his assaults against all. For as, when Adam had transgressed, his sin reached unto all men, so, when the Lord had become man and had overthrown the Serpent, that exceeding strength of His should extend to all men, so that each of us may say, *For we are not ignorant of his devices.* Good reason then that the Lord, who is everlasting and in nature immutable, loving righteousness and hating iniquity, should be anointed and Himself sent on mission, that, being and remaining the same, He *might*, by taking this alterable flesh, *condemn sin in it*, and might secure its freedom, and its ability henceforth *to fulfil the righteousness of the law* in itself, so as to be able to say, *But we are*

not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in us. Ed. Ben. i. § 51—52.

85. Vainly then, here again, O Arians, have ye made this supposition, and vainly alleged the words of Scripture; for the Word of God is unalterable, and is ever in one state, and that no other than the Father's; since how is He like the Father, unless He be thus? or how is all that is the Father's, the Son's also, if He has not the unalterableness and unchangeableness of the Father? Not as being subject to laws, and as being impelled this way and that, does He love this and hate that (for to say that from fear of disadvantage He chose the opposite, would only be to admit in another way that He is alterable); but, as being God and the Father's Word, He is a just judge and lover of virtue, or rather its source. Therefore being just and holy by nature, on this account He is said to love righteousness and to hate iniquity; as much as to say, that He loves and takes to Him the virtuous, and rejects and hates the unrighteous. This is only what divine Scripture says of the Father too: *The Righteous Lord loveth righteousness: Thou hatest all them that work iniquity;* and, *The Lord loveth the gates of Sion, more than all the dwellings of Jacob;* and, *Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated;* and in Esaias, there is the voice of God again saying, *I the Lord love righteousness, and I hate grasping ways.* They ought then to expound those former words which relate to the Son, as these latter which relate to the Father; it is but reasonable, for the Son is the Father's Image. Else, if the former imply that the Son is alterable, the latter will imply change in the Father too. But since to hear this even supposed in controversy may have a bad effect on the mind, let us rule it at once that, when it is said that God loves righteousness and hates unrighteous grasping, this does not mean that He looks towards both the one and the other, and is capable of either, selecting the one and passing by the

CHAP. XIII. other, as it may be, for this is characteristic of the creature, but that, as a judge, He loves and takes to Him the righteous and withdraws from the bad. It follows then to think the same concerning the Image of God also, that He loves and hates no otherwise than thus. For such must be the nature of the Image as is Its Father, though the Arians in their blindness fail to see either that Image or any other truth of the divine oracles. For when forced from the conceptions, or rather misconceptions, of their own hearts, they fall back upon passages of divine Scripture, here too, from dulness of intellect, according to their wont, they discern not their meaning; and laying down their own impiety as a sort of canon of interpretation, they wrest the whole of the divine oracles into accordance with it. And so, as soon as they give utterance to such doctrine, they deserve nothing more than to be told, *Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God;* and if they persist in it, they must be put to silence, by the words, *Render to* man *the things that are* man's, *and to God the things that are God's.*

CHAPTER XIV.

Answer to objections from Scripture; thirdly, Hebrews i. 4.

86. BUT it is written, say they, in the Proverbs, *The Lord created Me the beginning of His ways, for His works;* and in the Epistle to the Hebrews the Apostle says, *Being made so much better than the Angels, as He hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent Name than they.* And soon after, *Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus, who was faithful to Him that appointed Him.* And in the Acts, *Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly.*

that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ. These passages they have brought forward at every turn, mistaking their sense, and fancying they proved that the Word of God was a creature and work, and one of things that were brought into being; and thus they deceive the thoughtless, putting forth the words of Scripture as their pretence, but instead of the true sense of it, sowing upon it the poison of their own heresy. For had they known, they would not have been impious against *the Lord of glory*, nor have wrested the good words of Scripture into a wrong direction. This is what comes of their appeal to Scripture; but after all it were well, did we know where precisely to find them, or if they knew for certain themselves where they stand. Do they, for instance, as they sometimes seem to do, hold to Caiaphas and his Jews, who look for some temporal greatness from "God dwelling upon earth?" If so, why do they quote the words of the Apostles, which are out of place with Jews? Or again, denying that the Word was made flesh, what right have they as if Manichees to appeal to the Proverbs, an Old Testament book, in their favour? Or if, for secular reasons, from ambition, lucre, or from regard of public opinion, they are forced to say in words contrary both to Jews and Manichees, that *the Word was made flesh*, why do they make their confession of faith by halves, instead of speaking out, and interpreting St.. John's words of the incarnate presence of the Saviour, since we are to consider that they do not otherwise interpret it? For it is not seemly, while confessing that the *Word became flesh*, yet to be ashamed at what is written of Him, and on that account to pervert the sense.

Ed. Ben. i. § 52—54.

87. Thus, it is written, *Having become so much better than the Angels;* let us then first examine this. Now it is right and necessary, as in all divine Scripture, so here, faithfully to expound the occasion concerning which the Apostle wrote, and the person, and the thing, lest the reader, from

CHAP. XIV. ignorance missing either these or any similar particular, should be wide of the true sense. This principle understood that earnestly inquiring eunuch, when he thus besought Philip, *I pray thee, of whom doth the Prophet speak this? of himself, or of some other man?* for he feared lest, expounding the lesson of the wrong person, he should wander from the right drift. And the disciples, wishing to learn the time of what was foretold, besought the Lord, *Tell us*, said they, *when shall these things be? and what is the sign of Thy coming?* And again, hearing from the Saviour the events of the end, they desired to learn the time of it, not only that they might be kept from error themselves, but that they might be able to teach others; as, for instance, when they had learned, they set right the Thessalonians, who were going wrong. When then a man knows properly these points, his understanding of the faith is right and healthy; but if he mistakes any such, forthwith he falls into heresy. Thus the party of Hymenæus and Alexander were beside the time, when they said that the resurrection had already been; and the Galatians were after the time, in making much of circumcision now. And to miss the person was the lot of the Jews and is still, who think that of one of themselves it is said, *Behold, a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son, and they shall call His Name Emmanuel, which is, being interpreted, God with us;* and that, *A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up to you*, is spoken of one of the Prophets; and who, as to the words, *He was led as a sheep to the slaughter*, instead of learning from Philip, conjecture them to be spoken of Esaias or some other of the Prophets which had been.[7]

[7] The more common evasion on the part of the Jews was to interpret the prophecy of their own sufferings in captivity. It was an idea of Grotius that the prophecy received a first fulfilment in Jeremiah, vid. Justin. Tryph. 72, et al. Iren. Hær. iv. 33. Tertull. in Jud. 9. Cyprian. Testim. in Jud. ii. 13. Euseb. Dem. iii. 2, &c.

88. Such has been the state of mind under which Christ's enemies have fallen into their foul heresy. For had they known the person, and the thing, and the occasion to which the Apostle's words relate, they would not have expounded of Christ's divinity what belongs to His manhood, nor in their folly have committed so great an impiety.[8] Now this will be readily seen, if one expounds properly the beginning of this passage. For the Apostle says, *God who at sundry times and diverse manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son;* and then again shortly after he says, *when He had by Himself purged our sins, He sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high, having become so much better than the Angels, as He hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent Name than they.* Here, first, who is spoken of?[9] the Son of God; He is the person. And the time? later than the prophets, and when He took flesh. And what was the thing done? the purging of our sins. Proceeding then with his account of that economy in which we are concerned, and speaking of the last times, the Apostle is naturally led to observe that not even in the former times was God silent with men, but spoke to them by the Prophets. And, whereas the Prophets ministered, and the Law was spoken by Angels, therefore when the Son too visited the earth, and that in order to minister, he was forced to add, *Having become so much better than the Angels,* wishing to show that, as much as the Son excels a servant, so much also the ministry of the Son is better than the ministry of servants. Contrasting, then, the old ministry and the new, the Apostle speaks out to the Jews, writing and saying, *Become so much better than the Angels.*

ED. BEN. i. § 54—55.

[8] This implies, as above, that the truths of Scripture are not to be picked out and ascertained from the sacred text by induction, but can no otherwise be learned than by coming to Scripture after a definite instruction.

[9] Vid. p. 29, infr. p. 257, Sent. Dion. § 4.

CHAP. XIV. This is the occasion and the drift of the passage, ——— but here these men find two difficulties; first, they object, that the Apostle says that our Lord has "become," but to become is to come to be, that is, to have a beginning. Again, secondly, he calls Him "better than the Angels;" that is, the Son Himself is an Angel, though better than the rest. This is what they urge against the orthodox doctrine.

89. [1] Now, if they insist on the Apostle's language as being the language of comparison, and on comparison as denoting a oneness of kind, so that the Son is of the nature of Angels, they will in the first place incur the disgrace of rivalling and repeating what Valentinus held, and Carpocrates, and those other heretics, of whom the former said that the Angels were one in kind with the Christ, and the latter that Angels are the framers of the world. Perchance it is under the instruction of these masters that they compare the Word of God with the Angels; yet what likeness is there between the one and the other? Surely amid such speculations, they will be moved by the Psalmist, saying, *Who is he among the gods that shall be like unto the Lord?* and, *Among the gods there is none like unto Thee, O Lord.* It is true, as they say, that comparison does belong to subjects one in kind, not to those which differ. No one, for instance, would compare God with man, or again, man with brutes, nor wood with stone, because their natures are unlike; but God is beyond comparison, and man is compared to man, and wood to wood, and stone to stone. This is true, but in such cases we speak not of *better*, but of "rather" and of "more;" thus Joseph was comely rather than his brethren, and Rachel than Leah; star is not better than star, but rather excels in glory; whereas

[1] There is apparently much confusion in the arrangement of the paragraphs that follow; though the appearance may perhaps arise from Athan.'s incorporating some passage from a former work into his text; vid. supr. p. 208, note. Attempts have been made here to make the order more simple.

in bringing together things which differ in kind, then *better* is used to mark the difference. Observe then, had the Apostle said, "by so much has the Son precedence of the Angels," or "by so much greater," or more honourable, you would have had a plea, as if the Son were compared with the Angels; but he does not say so, he says, *better*, and in saying that He is *better*, and differs as far as Son differs from servants, the Apostle shows that He is other than the Angels in nature. Ed. Ben. I. § 55—62.

90. And of this we have proof from divine Scripture: David, for instance, saying in the Psalm, *One day in Thy courts is better than a thousand;* and Solomon crying out, *Receive my instruction and not silver, and knowledge beyond choice gold. For wisdom is better than rubies; and all the things that may be desired are not to be compared to it.* Are not wisdom and stones of the earth different in substance and separate in nature? Are heavenly courts at all akin to earthly houses? Or is there any similarity between things eternal and spiritual, and things temporal and mortal? And this is what Esaias says, *Thus saith the Lord unto the eunuchs that keep My sabbaths, and choose the things that please Me, and take hold of My Covenant; even unto them will I give in Mine house, and within My walls, a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters: I will give them an everlasting name that shall not be cut off.* Therefore in like manner there is nought of kin between the Son and the Angels: so that the word *better* is not used to compare but to contrast, because of the difference of His nature from them. And therefore the Apostle also himself, when he interprets the word *better*, places its force in nothing short of the Son's excellence over things created, calling the one Son, the other servants; the one, as a Son with the Father sitting on His right; and the others as servants, standing before Him, and being sent, and fulfilling offices. Scripture, in speaking

CHAP. XIV. thus, implies, O Arians, not that the Son is brought into being, but rather that He is other than such beings as have a beginning, and belongs to the Father, being in His bosom.

91. If indeed He be in substance other than and distinct from created things, what comparison of His substance can there be, or what likeness to them? And this Paul makes plain in this very passage, *For unto which of the Angels said He at any time, Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee? And of the Angels He saith, Who maketh His Angels spirits, and His ministers a flame of fire.* Observe here the word *made* belongs to things that come into being, and he calls them works; but to the Son he speaks not of a making, nor of a becoming, but of eternity and kingship, and a Framer's office, exclaiming, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever;* and, *Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of Thine hands; they shall perish, but Thou remainest.* From which words even they, were they but willing, might perceive that the Framer is other than the things framed, the former being God, the latter being creatures which have been made out of nothing. Not that, *They shall perish*, means as if the creation were destined for destruction, but the words indicate the nature of things created by the issue to which they tend. For things which admit of perishing, though, through the grace of their Maker, they perish not, yet have come out of nothing, and themselves witness that they once were not. And on this account, since their nature is such, it is said of the Son, *Thou remainest*, to show His eternity; for not having the capacity of perishing, as things have which began to be, but having eternal duration, it is foreign to Him to have it said, "He was not before His generation," but it belongs to Him to be always, and to endure together with the Father. And though the Apostle had not thus written in his Epistle to

the Hebrews, still his other Epistles, and the whole of Scripture, would certainly forbid their entertaining such notions concerning the Word. But since he has here expressly written it, and, as has been above shown, the Son is Offspring of the Father's substance, and He is Framer, and other things are framed by Him, and He is the Radiance and Word and Image and Wisdom of the Father, and things are made to stand and serve in their place below the Trinity, therefore the Son is different in kind and different in substance from things created, and on the contrary belongs to the Father's substance and is one in nature with it. And hence it is that the Son too says not *My Father is better than I*, lest we should conceive Him to be foreign to His Father's Nature, but *greater*, not indeed in fulness of powers, nor in length of time, but because of His generation from the Father Himself; nay, in saying *greater* He again shows that He is proper to His substance. Ed. Ben. i. § 55—62.

92. At the same time, though the Apostle's words so clearly discriminate the substance of the Word from the nature of creatures, what he directly had in view, when he contrasted the one with the other, and called Him better than them, was the Lord's visitation in the flesh and the economy which He then sustained, and which showed that He was not like those former messengers; so that, as much as He excelled in nature those who were sent before by Him, by so much also the grace which came from and through Him was better than the ministry through Angels. For it is the function of servants to demand the fruits and no more; but of the Son and Master to forgive the debts and to transfer the vineyard.

93. And this is what the Apostle proceeds to show: *Therefore*, he says, *we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by Angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recom-*

CHAP. XIV. *pense of reward; how shall we escape if we neglect* ——— *so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard Him.* But if the Son were in the number of things created, He was not better than they, nor did disobedience involve increase of punishment because of Him; any more than in the Ministry of Angels there would be, according to each Angel, greater or less guilt in the transgressors, but the law was one, and one was its vengeance on transgressors. But, whereas the Word is not in the number of created things, but is Son of the Father, therefore, as He Himself is better and His acts better and transcendent, so also the punishment is worse. Let them contemplate then the grace which is through the Son, and let them acknowledge the witness which He gives even from His works, that He is other than things created, and alone the very Son in the Father and the Father in Him. And the Law was spoken by Angels, and perfected no one, needing the visitation of the Word, as Paul hath said; but that visitation in the flesh has perfected the work of the Father. And then, from Adam unto Moses death reigned; but the presence of the Word abolished death. And no longer in Adam are we all dying; but in Christ we are all reviving. And then from Dan to Bersabe was the Law proclaimed, and in Judea only was God known; but now, unto all the earth has gone forth their voice, and all the earth has been filled with the knowledge of God, and the disciples have made disciples of all the nations, and now is fulfilled what is written, *They shall be all taught of God.* And then what was revealed, was but a type; but now the truth has been manifested.[2] And this again the Apostle himself

[2] Parts of this chapter are much more finished in style than the general course of his Orations. It may be indeed only the natural consequence of his warming with his subject, but this eloquent passage looks very much like an insertion. Some

describes afterwards more clearly, saying, *By so much did Jesus become surety of a better testament;* and again, *But now hath He obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also He is the Mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises.* And, *For the Law made nothing perfect, but was the bringing in of a better hope.* And again he says, *It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.* Both in the verse before us then, and throughout, does he ascribe the word *better* to the Lord, who is better and other than created things. For better is the sacrifice through Him, better the hope in Him; and also the promises through Him, not merely as great compared with small, but the one differing from the other in nature, because He who conducts this economy is *better* than all creatures.

94. "*Better*" then, as has been said, could not have been brought to pass in any other than the Son, who sits on the right hand of the Father. And what does this denote but that the Son is really Son, and that the Godhead of the Father is the same as the Son's? For, because the Son reigns in His Father's kingdom, hence is He seated upon the same throne as the Father, and because contemplated in the Father's Godhead, therefore is the Word God, and whoso beholds the Son, beholds the Father; and thus there is but one God. Sitting then on the right, yet hath He not His Father on the left; but, whatever is right and precious in the Father, that also the Son has, and He says, *All things that the Father hath are Mine.* Wherefore also the Son, though sitting on the right, also sees the Father on the right, though it be as having become man, that He says,

words of it are found in Sent. D. 11, written a few years sooner. He certainly transcribed himself in other places, as S. Leo, e.g., repeats himself in another controversy.

CHAP. XIV. *I saw the Lord always before My face, for He is on My right hand, therefore I shall not fall.* This shows moreover, that the Son is in the Father and the Father in the Son; for the Father being on the right, the Son is on the right;[3] and while the Son sits on the right of the Father, the Father is in the Son. And the Angels indeed minister ascending and descending; but concerning the Son He saith, *And let all the Angels of God worship Him.* And when Angels minister, they say, "I am sent unto thee," and "the Lord has commanded;" but the Son, though He say in human fashion, "I am sent," and comes to finish the work and to minister, nevertheless says, as being Word and Image, *I am in the Father, and the Father in Me;* and *He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father;* and *The Father that abideth in Me, He doeth the works;* for whatever we behold in that Image is the Father's handiwork.

95. And now coming, secondly, to the expression *become*, which here occurs, neither does this show that the Son is created, as you suppose. If indeed it were simply *become* and no more, a case might stand for the Arians; but whereas they are forestalled with the word *Son* throughout the passage, showing that He is other than things created, so again not even the word *become* occurs absolutely, but *better* is immediately subjoined to it. For the writer thought the expression immaterial, knowing that in the case of one who was confessedly a genuine Son, to say *become* is the same with saying that He had only in some sense been made, and that He is in a

[3] Nec ideo tamen quasi humanâ formâ circumscriptum esse Deum Patrem arbitrandum est, ut de illo cogitantibus dextrum aut sinistrum latus animo occurrat; aut id ipsum quod sedens Pater dicitur, flexis poplitibus fieri putandum est, ne in illud incidamus sacrilegium, &c. August. de Fid. et Symb. 14. Does this passage of Athan.'s show that the Anthropomorphites were stirring in Egypt already?

certain relation *better*. For it matters not, should we speak of what is really generate, as "become" or "made;" but on the contrary, things made, God's handiwork as they are, cannot be called generate, except so far as after their making they partake of the Son who is the true Generate, and are therefore said themselves to have been generated also, not at all because of their own nature, but because of their participation of the Son in the Spirit. And this again divine Scripture recognises; for it not only says in the case of things really made, *All things came to be through Him*, and *without Him there was not anything made*, and, *In Wisdom hast Thou made them all;* but in the case of sons also who are really generate, *To Job there came seven sons and three daughters*, and *Abraham was an hundred years old when there became to him Isaac his son;* and Moses said, *If to any one there come sons.* Therefore, since the Son is other than things created, and is alone the proper Offspring of the Father's substance, this plea of the Arians from the word *become* is worth nothing. ED. BEN. I. § 55—62.

96. The quarrel then between us and them turns on the previous question, whether the Son is a real Son, or in name only, not in fact. If He is already known to be the genuine Offspring of the Father, then "*become*" will do His divine greatness no harm; but certainly, if Sonship has still to be proved as His own, then this expression, as far as it goes, may be used as an argument against His possessing it. But, if it is to prevail, let them not in mere consistency separate Him and the other inhabitants of heaven. If He is to be accounted an Angel, and has come to be such as the rest have, let Him share their nature; if they are sons, let Him be creature; if He stands before the Throne, let them all, as well as Him, be on the Right Hand. This must be, if Arius can bring Scripture on his side; but if, on the other hand, Paul, as I have already quoted him, distinguishes the Son from things made, say-

CHAP. XIV. ing, *To which of the Angels said He at any time, Thou art My Son?* and the One frames heaven and earth, but they come into being by Him, and He sitteth with the Father, but they stand-by ministering, who does not see that he has not used the word *become* of the substance of the Word, but of that special ministration to which He condescended? For as, being the *Word*, He *became flesh*, so when become man, He became by so much better in His ministry than the ministry which came by the Angels, as Son excels servants and Framer things framed. Let them cease therefore to take the word *become* to relate to the substance of the Son, for He is not one of things that have come to be; and let them acknowledge that it is indicative of His ministry, and of the economy of which His coming was a condition.

97. Moreover, that He is said to have become our surety, in the passage which I just now quoted, explains in what sense the word *become* is to be taken. He became our surety by taking flesh; then it was therefore that He *became better than the Angels*, viz., when He visited the earth and was born of Mary. Paul then does not speak of the Son, Wisdom, Radiance, Image of the Father, coming to be, but of His coming to be the minister of the covenant, in which death, which once ruled, is abolished; for here also the ministry which is through Him has become better, in that *what the Law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His Own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh*, ridding it of the trespass, in which, being continually held captive, it admitted not the Divine Mind. And having rendered the flesh capable of the Word, He made us walk, no longer according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit, and say again and again, "But we are not in the flesh but in the Spirit," and, "For the Son of God came into the world, not to judge the world, but

to redeem all men and that the world might be saved through Him." Formerly the world, as guilty, was under judgment from the Law; but now the Word has taken on Himself the judgment, and having suffered in the body for all, has bestowed salvation upon all. With a view to this, hath John exclaimed, *The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.* Better is grace than the Law, and truth than the shadow. Ed. Ben. i. § 55—62.

98. To conclude: If they still carry on the contest, it will be natural to meet them with the force of those similar expressions which are used concerning the Father Himself. This may serve to prevail with them to refrain their tongue from evil, or may teach them the depth of their folly. Now it is written, *Become my strong rock and house of defence, that Thou mayest save me.* And again, *The Lord became a defence for the poor*, and like passages, which are found in divine Scripture. If then they apply these passages to the Son, which perhaps is nearest the truth, then let them acknowledge that the sacred writers ask Him, as not being a creature, to become to them *a strong rock and house of defence;* and for the future let them understand *become*, and *He made*, and *He created*, of His incarnate presence. For then did He become *a strong rock and house of defence*, when He bore our sins in His own body upon the tree, and said, *Come unto Me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.*

99. However, if they are unwilling thus to interpret, and therefore refer these passages to the Father, will they, when it is here also written, "Become" and "He became," venture so far as to affirm that God has come into being? Yea, they will dare, as they thus argue concerning His Word; for the course of their argument carries them on to conjecture the same things concerning the Father, as they devise concerning His Word. But far be such a notion ever from the thoughts of all the faithful! for neither

CHAP. XIV. is the Son in the number of things made, nor do the words of Scripture in question, *Become*, and *He became*, denote beginning of being, but that succour in Him which comes to the needy. For God is always, and one and the same; but men came into being afterwards through the Word, when the Father Himself willed it; and God is invisible and inaccessible to created things, and especially to men upon earth. When then men in infirmity invoke Him, when in persecution they ask help, when under injuries they pray, then the Invisible, being a lover of man, shines forth upon them with His beneficence, which He exercises through and in His proper Word. And forthwith the divine manifestation is made to every one according to his need, and He becomes to the weak in health, and to the persecuted, a *refuge* and *house of defence;* and to the injured He says, *While Thou speakest I will say here I am.* Moreover the usage of men recognises this, and every one will confess its propriety. Often succour comes from man to man; one has undertaken toil for the injured, as Abraham for Lot; and another has opened his home to the persecuted, as Abdias to the sons of the prophets; and another has entertained a stranger, as Lot the Angels; and another has supplied the needy, as Job those who begged of him. As then, should one and the other of these benefited persons say, "Such a one became an assistance to me," and another "and to me a refuge," and "to another a supply," yet in so saying would not be speaking of the origination or of the substance of their benefactors, but of the beneficence coming to themselves from them, so also when the sacred writers say concerning God, *He became*, and *become Thou*, they do not denote any original becoming, for God is unoriginate and ingenerate, but the salvation which comes to pass in the case of men from Him.

100. This being so understood, it is parallel also respecting the Son, that whatever, and however often, a phrase

occurs, such as *became* and *become*, it should ever be taken in the same sense: for when *the Word became flesh and dwelt among us*, and came to minister and to bestow salvation on all, then He became to us salvation, and became life, and became propitiation; then His economy in our behalf became better than the Angels, and He became the Way and became the Resurrection. And as the words *Become my strong rock* do not denote that the substance of God Himself became, but His loving-kindness, as has been said, so also here the *having become better than the Angels*, and *He became*, and *by so much is Jesus become a better surety*, do not signify that the substance of the Word is created (perish the thought!), but the beneficence which towards us came through His incarnation; unthankful though the heretics be, and obstinate in behalf of their impiety.

Ed. Ben. i. § 63—64.

DISCOURSE II.

Chapter XV.

Answer to objections from Scripture; Fourthly, Hebrews iii. 2.

Chap. XV.

101. I did indeed think that enough had been said already against the hollow professors of Arius's madness, whether for their refutation or in the truth's behalf. They, however, do not succumb; but even invent new modes for their impiety. Thus they misunderstand the passage in the Proverbs, *The Lord hath created Me a beginning of His ways for His Works*, and the words of the Apostle, *Who was faithful to Him that made Him*, and argue outright, that the Son of God is a work and a creature. But although they might have learned from what is said above, had they not utterly lost their power of apprehension, the Truth witnessing it, that the Son is not from nothing nor in the number of things created at all, (for being God, He cannot be a work, and it is a sin to call Him a creature, and it is of creatures and works that we say, "it was out of nothing," and "it was not before its generation,") yet since, as if dreading to desert their own fiction, they are accustomed to allege the aforesaid passages of divine Scripture, which have a good meaning, but are by them practised on, let us proceed afresh to take up the question of the sense of these, in order to remind the faithful, and as to the Arians to show from each of these passages that they have no knowledge at all of Christianity. Were it other-

wise, they would not have *shut* themselves *up in the unbelief* of the present Jews, but would have inquired and learned that, whereas *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God*, therefore it was on the Word's becoming man at the good pleasure of the Father, that it was suitably said of Him, as by John, *The Word became flesh*, so by Peter, *He hath made Him Lord and Christ;* and, as by means of Solomon in the Person of the Lord Himself, *The Lord created Me a beginning of His ways for His works*, so by Paul, *become so much better than the Angels;* and again, *He emptied Himself and took upon Him the form of a servant;* and again, *Therefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Jesus, who was faithful to Him that made Him.* For all these texts have the same force and meaning, a religious one, declarative of the divinity of the Word, even those of them which speak humanly concerning Him, as having become Son of man. ED. BEN. ii. § 1—2.

102. But, though this distinction is sufficient in itself for their refutation, still, since from a misconception of the Apostle's words, (to mention them first,) they consider the Word of God to be one of the works, because of its being written, *Who was faithful to Him that made Him*, I have thought it needful to silence this reiterated argument of theirs, taking in hand, as before, their own statement.

103. If then, He be not a Son, let Him be called a work, and let all that is said of works be said of Him, nor let Him and Him alone be designated Son, and Word, and Wisdom; neither let it belong to God Himself to be called Father, but only Framer and Creator of the things which by Him are brought into being; and let the creature be Image and Impress of His framing will, and let Him, as they would have it, be without generative nature, so that there is neither Word, nor Wisdom, no,

CHAP. XV. nor Image, of His proper substance. For if He be not Son, neither is He Image. But again, if there be not a Son, how then say you that God is a Creator? since all things that come to be are through the Word and in Wisdom, and without This nothing can be, whereas you say He hath not That, in and through which He makes all things. For if the Divine Substance be not fruitful Itself, but barren, as they hold, as a light that lightens not, and a dry fountain, are they not ashamed to speak of His possessing framing energy? and whereas they deny That which is by nature, do they not blush to put before It that which is by will? But if He frames things that are external to Him and were not before, by willing them to be, and becomes their Maker, much more will He first be Father of an Offspring from His proper Substance. For if they attribute to God the willing with respect to things which are not, why do they not recognise that in God which lies above the will? now it is a something that surpasses will, that He should have a nature, and should be Father of His proper Word. If then that which comes first, which is according to nature, does not exist, as they would have it in their folly, how can that which is second come to be, which is according to will? for the Word is first, and then the creation.

104. On the contrary, the Word exists, whatever they dare to say, those impious ones; for through Him did creation come to be, and God, as being Maker, plainly hath also His framing Word, not external, but belonging to Him;—for this must be repeated. If He has the power of will, and His will is effective, and suffices for the consistence of the things that come into being, and if again His Word is effective and a Framer, that Word must surely be the Living Will of the Father, and His energy in substance, and His real Word, in whom all things both consist and are excellently governed. No one

can even doubt, that He who disposes is prior to the disposition and the things disposed. And thus, as I said, God's creating is second to His begetting; for Son implies something proper to Him and truly from that blessed and everlasting Substance; but what is only from His will comes into consistence from without, and is framed through His proper Offspring who is from that Substance. ED. BEN. II. § 2—3.

105. In the judgment of reason then they are guilty of great extravagance who say that the Lord is not Son of God, but a work, and it follows that we all of necessity confess that He is Son. And if He be Son, as indeed He is, and a son is confessedly, not external to his father, but from him, let them not question about the terms, as I said before, which the sacred writers use concerning the Word Himself, (for instance, not "Him that begat Him" but *Him that made Him*), for as long as it is confessed what His nature is, the particular words used of Him in such instances need raise no question. For terms do not disparage His nature; rather that Nature draws to Itself those terms and changes their sense. For terms are not prior to substances, but substances are first, and terms second.[1] Wherefore also when the substance is a work or creature, then the words *He made*, and *He became*, and *He created*, are used of it properly, and designate the work. But when the Substance is an Offspring and Son, then *He made*, and *He became*, and *He created*, no longer properly belong to it, nor designate a work; but we use *He made* without question for "He begat."

106. Yet, in spite of what is so plain, they insist upon *Who made* as some great support of their heresy. But this stay of theirs is but a broken reed; for if they were aware of the style of Scripture, they must at once give sentence

[1] Here again, as was noted above, Athan. shows how persistently he starts with an ecclesiastical tradition, and the assumption of a dogma.

CHAP. XV. against themselves. For I repeat, although parents speak of the sons whom they beget as "being made" and "being created," for all this they do not deny their nature. Thus Ezechias, as is written in Esaias, said in his prayer, *From this day I will make children, who shall declare Thy righteousness, O God of my salvation.* He then said, *I will make;* but the Prophet in that very book and the Fourth of Kings, thus speaks, *And the sons who shall come forth of thee.* He uses then *make* for "beget," and he calls those who were to spring from him, *made*, and no one questions whether the term has reference to a natural offspring. Again, Eve, on bearing Cain, said, *I have gotten a man from the Lord;* thus she too used *gotten* for "brought forth." For, though she had herself borne the child, she said, *I have gotten.* Nor would any one consider, because of *I have gotten*, that Cain was purchased from without, instead of being born of her. Again, the Patriarch Jacob said to Joseph, *And now thy two sons, Ephraim and Manasses, which became thine in Egypt, before I came unto thee into Egypt, are mine.* And Scripture says about Job, *And there came to him seven sons and three daughters.* As Moses too has said in the Law, *If sons become to any one*, and, *If he make a son.* Here again they have spoken of those who were begotten, as *become* and *made*, knowing that, so long as they are acknowledged to be sons, we need not make a question of *they became*, or *I have gotten*, or *I made.* For nature and the truth of the case draw the meaning to themselves.

107. This being so, when men ask whether the Lord is a creature or work, it is proper to ask of them this first, whether He is or is not Son and Word and Wisdom. For if this is shown, the surmise about work and creation falls to the ground at once and is ended. For what is a work could never be a Son and Word; nor could the Son be a work. And the Lord being proved to be the Father's Son

naturally and genuinely, and Word, and Wisdom, though *He made* be used concerning Him, or *He became*, this is not said of Him as if a work, but the sacred writers use the words indiscriminately as in the case of Solomon, and Ezechias's children. For though the fathers had begotten them from themselves, still it is written, *I have made*, and *I have gotten*, and *He became*. Therefore God's enemies, in spite of their repeated allegation of such trifling words, ought now, however late in the day, after what has been said, to put away their impious thoughts, and think of the Lord as of a true Son, Word, and Wisdom of the Father, not a work, not a creature. For if the Son be a creature, by what word and by what wisdom was He made? for all the works were made through the Word and the Wisdom, as it is written, *In Wisdom hast Thou made them all*, and *All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made*. But if it be He who is the Word and the Wisdom, by which all things come to be, it follows that He is not in the number of works, nor in short of any things that are made, but the Offspring of the Father. ED. BEN. ii. § 3—5.

108. And as *made* is used for *begat*, so, as I have said, is servant used for Son. Fathers call the sons born of them their servants, yet without denying the genuineness of their nature; and often they affectionately call their own servants children, yet without putting out of sight their purchase of them originally; for they use the one appellation from their authority as being fathers, but in the other they speak from affection. Thus Sara called Abraham lord, though not a servant but a wife; and, while to Philemon who purchased him the Apostle joined Onesimus the servant as a brother, Bethsabe, although mother, called her son servant, saying to his father, *Thy servant Solomon*;—afterwards also Nathan the Prophet came in and repeated her words to David, *Solomon thy servant*. Nor did they think it mattered

CHAP. XV. to call the son a servant, for while David heard it, he recognised what his nature was, and they too, while they spoke it, forgot not his genuine sonship, praying that he might be made his father's heir, though they gave him the name of servant; for he to David was son by nature. As then, when we read this we interpret it fairly, without accounting Solomon a servant because we hear him so called, but a son natural and genuine, so also, if, concerning the Saviour, who is confessed to be in truth the Son, and to be the Word by nature, the sacred writers say, *Who was faithful to Him that made Him*, or if He say of Himself, *The Lord created Me*, and *I am thy servant and the Son of Thine handmaid*, and the like, let not any on this account deny that He is proper to the Father and from Him; but, as in the case of Solomon and David, let them have a right idea of the Father and the Son. For if, though they hear Solomon called a servant, they acknowledge him to be a son, are they not deserving of many deaths,[2] who instead of holding to the same explanation in the instance of the Lord, whenever they hear "Offspring," and "Word," and "Wisdom," forcibly misinterpret and deny the generation, natural and genuine, of the Son from the Father; and on hearing language and terms proper to a work, forthwith drop down to the notion of His being a work by nature, and deny the Word; and this, though it is possible, from His having been made man, to refer all these terms to His humanity? And are they not also proved to be *an abomination unto the Lord*, as having *diverse weights* with them, and with this weight estimating those other instances, and with that blaspheming the Lord?

109. Our Lord then, since a Son, cannot be a work: and now consider what grave consequences follow from so con-

[2] Vid. Append., *Use of Force.*

sidering Him. Solomon says in one place in Ecclesiastes, that *God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing whether it be good or whether it be evil.* If then the Word be a work, do you mean that He as well as others will be brought into judgment? and what room is there for judgment, when the Judge is on trial? who is there to give to the just their blessing, who to the unworthy their punishment, if the Lord, as you must suppose, is standing on trial with the rest? by what law shall the Lawgiver Himself be judged? These things belong to the works, blessing and punishment from the Son. Henceforth then fear your Judge, and listen to Solomon. For if God shall bring the works one and all into judgment, but the Son is not in the number of those works put on trial, but rather is Himself the Judge of works one and all, is not the proof clearer than the sun, that He is not a work but the Father's Word, in whom all the works both come into being and come into judgment? Ed. Ben. ii. § 5—6.

110. Further, if the expression, *Who was faithful*, is a difficulty to them, from the thought that *faithful* is used of Him as of others, as if He makes acts of faith and so receives the reward of faith, they must proceed at this rate to find fault with Moses, for saying, *God faithful and true*, and with St. Paul for writing, *God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able.* But when the sacred writers spoke thus, they were not thinking of God in a human way, but they acknowledged two senses of the word *faithful* in Scripture, first *believing*, then *trustworthy*, of which the former belongs to man, the latter to God. Thus Abraham was faithful, because he had faith in God's Word; and God faithful, for, as David says in the Psalm, *The Lord is faithful in all His words*, or is trustworthy, and cannot lie. Again, *If any faithful woman have widows*, she is so called for her right faith; but, *It is a faithful saying*, because what God hath spoken, has a claim

CHAP. XV. on our faith, for it is true, and nothing but truth. Accordingly the words, *Who is faithful to Him that made Him*, implies no paralled with others, nor means that by having faith He became well-pleasing; but that being Son of the True God, He too is faithful, and ought to be believed in all He says and does, Himself remaining unalterable and not changed in His human economy and incarnate presence.

111. Hitherto from a simple explanation of "made," I have shown how far that term is from an argument in behalf of the Word of God being a work. But this will be still clearer if we consider the occasion when it was used and for what purpose. Let it be observed then that the Apostle is not discussing things before the creation when he so speaks, but when *the Word became flesh;* for thus it is written, *Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Jesus, who was faithful to Him that made Him.* Now, when became He *Apostle*, but when He put on our flesh? and when became He *High Priest of our profession*, but when, after offering Himself for us, He raised His Body from the dead, and, as now, Himself brings near and offers to the Father those who in His faith approach Him, redeeming all, and for all propitiating God? Not then as wishing to signify the Substance of the Word nor His natural generation from the Father, did the Apostle say, *Who was faithful to Him that made Him*,—(perish the thought! for the Word is not made, but makes,)—but as signifying His descent to mankind and High-priesthood which was *a coming to be*, as—in the case of Priests—we may easily see from the account given of the Law and of Aaron.

112. I mean, Aaron was not born a high-priest, but a man; and in process of time, when God willed, he became high-priest; yet became so, not without conditions, nor by token of his ordinary garments, but putting over them the

ephod, the breastplate, the long vestments, which the women wrought at God's command, and going in them into the holy place, he offered the sacrifice for the people; and in them, as it were, mediated between the vision of God and the sacrifices of men. Thus then the Lord also, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God;* but when the Father willed that ransoms should be paid for all, and to all grace should be given, then truly the Word, as Aaron his vestment, so did He take earthly flesh, having Mary for the Mother of His Body as if virgin earth, that, as a High Priest, having an offering as others, He might offer Himself to the Father, and cleansing us all from sins in His own blood, might raise us from the dead. For what happened of old was a shadow of this; and what the Saviour did on His coming, this Aaron shadowed out according to the Law. As then Aaron was the same and did not change by putting on the high-priestly dress, but remaining the same was only vested, so that, had any one seen him offering, and had said, "Lo, Aaron has this day become high-priest," he had not implied that he then had been born man, for man he was even before he became high-priest, but that he had been made high-priest in his ministry, on putting on the garments made and prepared for the high-priesthood; in the same way it is possible in the Lord's instance also to understand suitably, that He did not become other than Himself on taking the flesh, but, being the same as before, He was robed in it; and the expressions *He became* and *He was made*, must not be understood as if the Word, considered as the Word, were made, but that the Word, being Framer of all, afterwards was made High Priest, by putting on a body which was brought into being and made, and such as He can offer for us, wherefore He is said to be made. If then indeed the Lord did not become man, that is a point for the Arians to battle; but if the *Word became*

ED. BEN. II. § 6—8.

CHAP. XV. *flesh*, what ought to have been said concerning Him when become man, but *Who was faithful to Him that made Him?* for as it is proper to the Word to have it said of Himself, *In the beginning was the Word*, so it is proper to a man to *become* and to be *made*. Who then, on seeing the Lord as a man going to and fro, and yet appearing to be God from His works, would not have asked, Who made Him man? and who again, if asked such a question, would not have answered, that the Father made Him man, and sent Him to us as High Priest?[3]

113. And this meaning, and time, and character,[4] the Apostle himself, the writer of the words, *Who is faithful to Him that made Him*, will best make plain to us, if we attend to what goes before them. For there is one train of thought, and the passage is all about One and the Same. He writes then in the Epistle to the Hebrews thus: *Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same; that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For nowhere doth He take hold of the Angels; but He taketh hold of the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that He Himself hath suffered being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted. Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Jesus; who was faithful to Him that*

[3] In such passages as this are taught without technical terms the theological truths that our Lord has but one personality, that it is placed in His Divinity not His humanity, that His humanity acts in Him as if an additional attribute, and that there is an interchange of the properties of Godhead with those of manhood in His one Person.

[4] Vid. supr. p. 237.

made Him. Who can read this whole passage without condemning the Arians, and admiring the blessed Apostle who has spoken so well? for when was Christ *made*, when became He *Apostle*, except when, like us, He *took part in flesh and blood?* And when became He *a merciful and faithful High Priest*, except when *in all things He was made like unto His brethren?* And then was He *made like*, when He became man, having put upon Him our flesh. Wherefore Paul was writing concerning the Word's human economy, when he said, *Who was faithful to Him that made Him*, and not concerning His Substance. Have not therefore any more the madness to say that the Word of God is a thing made, whereas He is Son by nature Only-begotten; and then had *brethren*, when He took on Him flesh like ours; which, moreover, Himself offering by Himself, He was named High Priest, and became *merciful and faithful*,—merciful, because in mercy to us He offered Himself for us, and faithful, not as sharing faith with us, nor as having faith in any one as we have, but as deserving to have faith placed in Him in all He says and does, and as offering a faithful sacrifice, one which remains and does not fail. For those which were offered according to the Law, had not this faithfulness, passing away with the day and needing a further cleansing; but the Saviour's sacrifice, taking place once, has perfected the whole, and is become faithful as remaining for ever. And Aaron had successors, and in a word the priesthood under the Law exchanged its first ministers as time and death went on; but the Lord, having a high-priesthood without transition and without succession, has become a *faithful High Priest*, as continuing for ever; and faithful too by promise, that He may hear and not mislead those who come to Him.

Ed. Ben. ii. § 8—9.

114. This may be also learned from the Epistle of great Peter, who says, *Let them that suffer according to the will of God, commit their souls to a faithful Creator*. For He

CHAP. XV. is faithful as not changing, but abiding ever, and rendering what He has promised. Now the so-called gods of the Greeks, unworthy the name, are faithful neither in their essence nor in their promises; for the same are not everywhere, nay, the local deities are wasting away as time goes on, and are undergoing a natural dissolution; wherefore the Word cries out against them, that *faith is not strong in them*, but they are *waters that fail*, and *in them there is no faith*. But the one only and really and true God of all, is faithful, who is ever the same, and says, *See now, that I, even I am He*, and *I change not;* and therefore His Son too is *faithful*, being ever the same and unchanging, deceiving neither in His essence nor in His promise;—as again says the Apostle, writing to the Thessalonians, *Faithful is He who calleth you, who also will do it;* for in doing what He promises, He is faithful to His words. And he thus writes to the Hebrews, showing that the epithet means "unchangeable:" *If we believe not, yet He abideth faithful; He cannot deny Himself.* Therefore reasonably the Apostle, discoursing concerning the bodily presence of the Word, says, an *Apostle and faithful to Him that made Him*, showing us that, even when made man, *Jesus Christ* is *the same yesterday and to-day, and for ever* is unchangeable. And as the Apostle makes mention in his Epistle of His being made man, when mentioning His High Priesthood, so too he kept no long silence about His Godhead, but rather mentions it forthwith, furnishing to us a safeguard on every side, and most of all when He speaks of His humiliation, that we may forthwith know His loftiness and His majesty which is the Father's. For instance, he says, *Moses as a servant, but Christ as a Son;* and the former *faithful in his house*, and the latter *over the house*, as having Himself built it, and being its Lord and Framer, and as God sanctifying it. For Moses, a man by nature, became faithful, as believing God who spoke to him by

His Word; but the Word was not as one of things which are made out of nothing in a bodily form, nor as creature in creature, but as God in flesh, and Framer and Builder of all in that which was built by Him. And men are clothed in flesh in order to be and to subsist; but the Word of God became man in order to sanctify the flesh, and, though He was Lord, was in the form of a servant; for the whole creation is the Word's servant, which by Him came to be and was made. Ed. Ben. ii. § 10—11.

115. Hence it holds that the Apostle's expression, *He made*, does not prove that the Word is made, but that body, which He took like ours; and in consequence He is called our brother, as having become man. But since it has been shown that even though the term *made* be referred to the Very Word, it is used for "begat," what further perverse expedient will they be able to fall upon, now that the present discussion has cleared up the term in every point of view, and shown that the Son is not a work, but in His Substance indeed the Father's Offspring, while in the Economy, according to the good pleasure of the Father, He was on our behalf made, and consists as man? For this reason then we read in the Apostle, *Who was faithful to Him that made Him;* and in the Proverbs, even His creation is spoken of. For so long as we are confessing that He became man, there is no question, as was observed before, whether we shall say "He became," or "He has been made," or "created," or "formed," or was "servant," or "son of a handmaid," or "son of man," or "was constituted," or "took a far journey," or "was bridegroom," or "brother's son," or "brother." All these terms happen to be proper to man's nature; and such as these do not designate the Substance of the Word, but that He has become man.

Chapter XVI.

Answer to objections from Scripture; Fifthly, Acts ii. 36

Chap. XVI. 116. The same too is the meaning of the passage ——— in the Acts which they also allege, viz., that in which Peter says, that *He hath made both Lord and Christ that same Jesus whom ye have crucified.* For here too it is not written, "He made for Himself a Son," or "He made Himself a Word," to countenance them in such notions. If then it has not escaped their memory, that they are speaking concerning the Son of God, let them make search whether it is anywhere written, "God made Himself a Son," or "He created for Himself a Word;" or again, whether it is anywhere written, in plain terms, "The Word is a work of creation;" for this is the point, and then let them proceed to make their case, that here too they may receive their answer. But if they can produce nothing of the kind, and only catch at such stray expressions as *He made* and *He has been made*, it is to be feared lest from hearing, *In the beginning God made the heaven and the earth*, and *He made the sun and the moon*, and *He made the sea*, they should come in time to call the Word the heaven, and the Light which took place on the first day, and the earth, and each particular thing that has been made, so as to end in resembling the Stoics, as they are called, the one drawing out their god into all things, the other putting God's Word on a level with each work in particular; which they have well-nigh done already, saying that He is one of His works.

117. But here they must have the same answer as before, and first be told, as before, that the Word is a Son and not a work, and that such terms are not to be understood of His Godhead, but the reason and manner of them investigated. To persons who so inquire the human economy will plainly present itself, which He undertook for our

sake. For Peter, after saying, *He hath made Lord and Christ*, straightway added, *this Jesus whom ye crucified;* which makes it plain to any one, (even, perhaps, to them, provided they attend to the context,) that not the Substance of the Word, but He according to His manhood is said by Peter to have been made. For what was crucified but the body? and how could be signified what was bodily in the Word, except by saying *He made?* Ed. Ben. ii. § 11—12.

118. Especially has that word, *He made*, a meaning in that place consistent with orthodox teaching;[5] in that Peter has not said, as I observed before, "He made Him Word," but *He made Him Lord*, nor that in general terms, but *towards* you, and *in the midst of* you, as much as to say, "He manifested Him." And this very thing has Peter himself, starting from this master doctrine, carefully expressed, when he said to them, *Ye men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man manifested of God towards you by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God did by Him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves know.* Consequently the term which he uses in the end, *made*, this he has explained in the beginning by *manifested*, for by the signs and wonders which the Lord did, He was manifested to be not merely man, but God in a body and Lord also, that is, the Christ. Such also signifies John in the Gospel, *Therefore the more did the Jews persecute Him, because He not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was His own Father, making Himself equal with God.* For the Lord did not then fashion Himself to be God, nor indeed is a made God conceivable, but He made Himself God by so manifesting Himself in the works, saying, *Though ye believe not Me, believe My works, that ye may know that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me.* Thus then it is that the Father has *made* Him Lord and King in the midst of us, and towards us, who were once disobedient; and it is plain that He

[5] Vid. Append. ὀρθός.

CHAP. XVI. who is now displayed as Lord and King, does not now begin to be King and Lord, but begins to show His Lordship, and to extend it even over the disobedient. If then they suppose that the Saviour was not Lord and King, even before He became man and endured the Cross, but then began to be Lord, let them know that they are openly reviving the statements of the Samosatene. But if, as we have noted and declared above, He is Lord and King everlasting, seeing that Abraham worships Him as Lord, and Moses says, *Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven;* and David in the Psalms, *The Lord said unto My Lord, Sit Thou on My right hand;* and, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of Thy Kingdom*, and *Thy Kingdom is an everlasting Kingdom*, it is plain that even before He became man, He was King and Lord everlasting, existing as Image and Word of the Father. And the Word being everlasting Lord and King, it is very plain again that Peter did not say that the Substance of the Son was made, but spoke of His lordship as extended over us, which *became* when He became man, and, redeeming all by the Cross, became Lord of all and King.

119. However, if they continue the argument on the ground of its being written, *He made*, as unwilling that *He made* should be taken in the sense of *He manifested*, either from want of apprehension, or from their Christ-assailing purpose, let them attend to another sound exposition of Peter's words. For he who becomes Lord of others, comes into the possession of beings already in existence; but if the Lord is Framer of all, and everlasting King, and when He became man, then gained possession of us, here too is a way in which Peter's language evidently does not signify that the Substance of the Word is a work, but denotes the subsequent subjection of all things, and the Saviour's Lordship over all which "became." And this coincides with what

we said before; for as we then introduced the words, *Become my God and defence*, and *the Lord became a refuge for the oppressed*, and it stood to reason that these expressions do not show that God has come into being, but that His beneficence *becomes* such towards each individual; such a sense hath the expression of Peter also. For the Son of God indeed, being Himself the Word, is Lord of all; but we formerly and originally were subject to the slavery of corruption and the curse of the Law, and then by degrees fashioning for ourselves things that were not, we served, as says the blessed Apostle, *them which by nature are no Gods*, and ignorant of the true God, we preferred things that were not to That which was; but afterwards, as the ancient people in Egypt groaned under their burdens, so, when we too had the Law implanted within us, and according to the unutterable moanings of the spirit made our intercession, *O Lord our God, take possession of us*, then, as *He became for a house of refuge* and a *God and defence*, so also He became our Lord. It was not that He then began to be, but we began to have Him for our Lord. For upon this, God being good and Father of the Lord, in pity, and desiring to be known by all, *makes* His own Son put on Him a human body and become man, and be called Jesus, that in this body offering Himself for all, He might deliver all from false worship and corruption, and might Himself become of all the Lord and King. Ed. Ben. ii. § 13—14.

120. His becoming therefore in this way Lord and King, this it is that Peter means by, *He hath made Him Lord* and *hath sent Him as Christ;* as much as to say that the Father in making Him man, (for to be made belongs to man,) did not simply make Him man, but has made Him man in order to His being Lord of all men, and to His hallowing all through His own Anointing. For though the Word existing in the form of God took a servant's form, yet the assumption of the flesh did not make a servant of the

CHAP. XVI. Word, who was by nature Lord; but rather, not only was it that emancipation of all humanity which takes place by the Word, but that very Word who was by nature Lord, and was then made man, hath by means of a servant's form been made Lord of all and Christ, that is, in order to hallow all by the Spirit. And as the great God, when *becoming a God and defence*, and saying, *I will be a God to them*, does not then become God more than He was before, but becomes such, at His pleasure, to those who need Him, so Christ, also being by nature Lord and King everlasting, does not, upon His mission, become Lord more than He was, nor then begin to be Lord and King, but then is made according to the flesh what in substance He had been ever; and, having redeemed all, He becomes thereby a second time Lord of quick and dead. For Him henceforth do all things serve, and this is David's meaning in the Psalm, *The Lord said unto My Lord, sit Thou on My right hand until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool.* For it was fitting that the redemption should take place through none other than Him who is the Lord by nature, lest, though created by the Son, we should name another as our Lord, and fall into the Arian and Greek folly, serving the creature beyond the all-creating God.

121. This, at least according to my nothingness, is the meaning of this passage; moreover, a true and a good meaning have these words of Peter as regards the Jews. For the Jews have wandered from the truth, while expecting the Christ as to come, in not reckoning that He undergoes a passion, saying what they understand not, viz., *We know that when the Christ cometh, He abideth for ever, and how sayest Thou that He must be lifted up?* Next they suppose Him, not the Word coming in flesh, but a mere man, as were all the kings. The Lord then, admonishing Cleophas and the other, taught them that the Christ must first suffer; and the rest of the Jews that God must sojourn

among them, saying, *If He called them gods to whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken, say ye of Him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said I am the Son of God?* Peter then, having learned this from the Saviour, in both points set the Jews right, saying, "O Jews, the divine Scriptures announce that Christ cometh, and you consider Him a mere man as one of David's descendants, whereas what is written of Him shows Him to be not such as you say, but rather announces Him as Lord and God, and immortal, and dispenser of life. For Moses has said, *Ye shall see your Life hanging before your eyes.*[6] And David in the hundred and ninth Psalm, *The Lord said unto My Lord, Sit Thou on My right hand, till I make Thine enemies Thy footstool;* and in the fifteenth, *Thou shalt not leave My soul in hell, neither shalt Thou suffer Thy Holy One to see corruption.* Now that these passages have not David for their scope he himself witnesses, avowing that He who was coming was his own Lord. Nay you yourselves know that he is dead, and his relics are with you. Ed. Ben. ii. § 14—16.

122. "That the Christ then must be such as the Scriptures say, you will all confess yourselves. For those announcements come from God, and in them falsehood can-

[6] Vid. Iren. Hær. iv. 10, 2. Tertull. in Jud. 11. Cyprian, Testim. iii. 2, n. 20. Lactant. Instit. iv. 18. Cyril, Catech. xiii. 19. August. contr. Faust. xvi. 22, which are referred to in loc. Cypr. (O. Tr.) To which add Leon. Serm. 59, 6. Isidor. Hisp. contr. Jud. i. 35, ii. 6. Origen, in Cels. ii. 75. Epiph. Hær. p. 75. Damasc. F. O. iv. 11, fin. This interpretation, I am told, is recommended even by the letter, which has תלואים לך מנגד, *ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν σου.* Sept. Pendebit tibi a regione, Gesenius; who also says, "Since things which are *à regione* of a place, are necessarily a little removed from it, it follows that מנגד signifies at the same time to be at a small distance," referring to the case of Hagar, who was but a bow-shot from her child. Also, though the word here is תלא, yet תלה which is the same root, is used for hanging on a stake, or crucifixion, e.g. Gen. xx. 19. Deut. xxi. 22. Esth. v. 14; vii. 10.

CHAP. XVI. not be. If then ye can state that such a one has come before, and can prove him God from the signs and wonders which he did, ye have reason for maintaining the contest; but if ye are not able to prove that He has come, but are expecting Him still, recognise the true season of His coming from Daniel, for his words relate to the present time. But if this present season be that which was of old afore-announced, and ye have seen what has taken place among us, be sure that this Jesus, whom ye crucified, this is the expected Christ. For David and all the Prophets are dead, and the sepulchres of all of them are with you, but that Resurrection which has now taken place has shown that the scope of these passages is Jesus. For His crucifixion is denoted by *Ye shall see your Life hanging*, and the wound in His side by the spear answers to *He was led as a sheep to the slaughter*, and the resurrection, nay more, the rising of the ancient dead from out their sepulchres, (for these most of you have seen,) this is, *Thou shalt not leave My soul in hell*, and *He swallowed up death in His strength*, and again, *God will wipe away*. For the signs which He actually displayed show that He who was in a body was God, and that He was the Life and Lord of death. For it became the Christ, when giving life to others, Himself not to be detained by death; but this could not have happened, had He, as you suppose, been a mere man. But in truth He is the Son of God, for to death all men are subjected.

123. "Let no one therefore doubt, but let the whole house of Israel know assuredly that this Jesus, whom ye saw in shape a man, doing signs and such works as no one ever yet had done, is Himself the Christ and Lord of all. For though made man, and called JESUS, as was said before, He received no loss by that human passion, but rather, in being made man, He is manifested as Lord of quick and dead. For since, as the Apostle said, *in the wisdom of God the*

world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. Ed. Ben. ii. § 16—17.

And so, since we men would not acknowledge God through His Word, nor serve the Word of God our natural Master, it pleased God to show in man His own Lordship, and so to draw all men to Himself. But to do this by a mere man beseemed not; lest, having man for our Lord, we should become worshippers of man. Therefore the Word Himself became flesh, and the Father called His Name Jesus, and so *made* Him Lord and Christ, as much as to say, 'He made Him to rule and to reign;' that while at the Name of Jesus, whom ye crucified, every knee bows, we may acknowledge as Lord and King both the Son and through Him the Father." This was the true meaning and drift of Peter's speech, and it had its effect upon his hearers. Most of them, on hearing it, came to a better mind,[7] although the Arians are where they were.

124. Were it likely to affect them, parallel cases might be mentioned. For instance, Isaac's blessing on his two sons. He said to Jacob, *Become thou lord over thy brother;* and to Esau, *Behold I have made him thy lord.* Now though the word *made* had implied Jacob's substance and coming into being, even then it would not be right in them so much as to imagine the same of the Word of God, for the Son of God is no creature as Jacob was,—a little thought might set their minds right herein. But if they do not understand such words of his substance nor of his coming into being, though Jacob was by nature creature and work, is not their madness worse than the Tempter's, if what in consequence of a parallel phrase they dare not ascribe even to things by nature creatures, this they attach to the Son of God,

[7] οἱ πλεῖστοι, vid. πόσαι μυριάδες, Act. xxi. 20. πολὺς τε ὄχλος τῶν ἱερέων, ibid. vi. 7. Vid. Jenkin on the Christian Religion, vol. ii. ch. 32. Lardner, Jewish and Heathen Test. ch. i. Burton, Eccles. Hist. first Cent. p. 50—52.

CHAP. XVI. saying that He is a creature? For Isaac said ——— *Become* and *I have made*, signifying neither the coming into being nor the substance of Jacob, (for after thirty years and more from his birth he said this,) but meaning his authority over his brother, which came to pass subsequently.

125. Much more then did Peter say this without intimating that the Substance of the Word was a work; for he knew Him to be God's Son, confessing, *Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God;* but he meant His Kingdom and Lordship which was formed and brought to pass according to grace and relatively to us. For while saying this, he was not silent about the Son of God's everlasting Godhead which is the Father's; moreover, he had said already, that He had poured the Spirit on us; now to give the Spirit with authority is not the act of creature or work, but the Spirit is God's Gift. For the creatures are hallowed by the Holy Spirit; but the Son, in that He is not hallowed by the Spirit, but on the contrary is Himself the Giver of it to all, is therefore no creature, but true Son of the Father. And yet, He who gives the Spirit, the Same is said also to be made; that is, to be made among us Lord by reason of His manhood, while giving the Spirit because He is God's Word. For He ever was and is, as Son, so also Lord and Sovereign King of all, being like in all things to the Father, and having all that is the Father's, as He Himself has said.

CHAPTER XVII.

Answer to objections from Scripture; Sixthly, Introductory to Proverbs viii. 22.

126. Now in the next place let us consider the passage in the Proverbs, *The Lord created Me a beginning of His ways*

for His works;[8] although in showing that the Word is no work, it has been also shown that He is no creature; for it is the same to say creature or work. Wherefore one may marvel at these men, thus inventing for themselves excuses for being impious, and nothing daunted at the refutations which meet them upon every point. For first[9] they set about deceiving the simple by their questions, "Did He who is, make Him that was not, from Him who was not, or Him that was?" and, "Had you a son, before begetting him?" And when this had been proved worthless, next they pitched upon the question, "Is the Ingenerate one or two?" Then, when in this they had been confuted, straightway they formed another, "Has He free-will and an alterable nature?" But being forced to give up this, next they set about saying, *Being made so much better than the Angels;* and when the Truth exposed this pretence, now again, collecting them all together, they think to recommend their heresy by *work* and *creature.* For they mean those very things over again, and are true to their own perverseness, putting into many shapes and turning to and fro the same errors, if so be, to deceive some by their look of richness and variety. Although then abundant proof has been given above of this, yet, since they make all places resound with this passage from the Proverbs, and to many who are ignorant of the faith

ED. BEN. II. § 17–18.

[8] We have found this text urged against the Catholic doctrine in the third century to support an Arian doctrine, supr. p. 46. Eusebius Nicomed., in his letter to Paulinus, adduces it against Alexander in the very beginning of the controversy, Theod. Hist. i. 5, p. 752. Athan. says, supr. p. 29, that after this it was again put forward by the Arians about A.D. 350. It is presently explained at greater length than any other of the texts he handles, forming the subject of the rest of this Discourse.

[9] From the methodical manner in which the previous portions of this Discourse are here referred to, it would almost seem as if he were answering in course some Arian work. He does not seem to be intending to trace the controversy historically.

CHAP. XVII. of Christians, seem to say something telling, it is necessary to examine separately, *He created*, as well as *Who was faithful to Him that made Him;* that, as in all other texts, so in this text also, they may be proved to have got no further than a fantasy.

127. And first let us see the answers, which they returned to Alexander of blessed memory, in the outset, while their heresy was in course of formation. They wrote thus: "He is a creature, but not as one of the creatures; a work, but not as one of the works; an offspring, but not as one of the offsprings." [10] Let every one consider the unscrupulous and crafty character of this heresy; for knowing the bitterness of its own malignity, it makes an effort to trick itself out with fair words, and says, what indeed it means, that He is a creature, yet thinks to be able to hide itself by adding, "but not as one of the creatures." However, in thus writing, they rather convict themselves of impiety the more; for if, in your opinion, He is simply a creature, why add the hypocritical exception, "but not as one of the creatures"? And if He is simply a work, how "not as one of the works"? In which we may see the poison of the heresy. For by saying, "offspring, but not as one of the offsprings," they reckon many sons, and one of these they pronounce to be the Lord; so that according to them He is no longer Only-begotten, but one out of many brethren, and is merely called offspring and son.

128. Of what use then is the hypocrisy of saying that He is a creature and then not a creature? for though ye shall say, Not as "one of the creatures," I will prove this sophism of yours to be a poor one. For still ye pronounce

[10] Vid. Arius's letter, supr. p. 97. This was the sophism by means of which Valens succeeded with the Fathers of Ariminum, vid. S. Jerome in Luciferian. 18, vid. also in Eusebius, supr. p. 58, and Append. *Eusebius.*

Him to be one of the creatures; and whatever a man might say of the other creatures, such ye hold concerning the Son, O truly *fools and blind.* For is any one of the creatures just what another is, that ye should predicate this of the Son as some prerogative? And all the visible creation was made in six days:—in the first, the light which He called day; and in the second the firmament; and on the third, He gathered together the waters, and bared the dry land, and brought out the various fruits that are in it; and on the fourth, He made the sun and the moon and all the host of the stars; and on the fifth He created the race of living things in the sea, and of birds in the air; and on the sixth, He made the quadrupeds on the earth, and at length man. And *the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made;* and neither the light is as the night, nor the sun as the moon; nor the irrational works as rational man; nor the Angels as the Thrones, nor the Thrones as the Powers, yet they are all creatures, but each of those things made exists and continues according to its kind and in its own substance, as it was made. Ed. Ben. ii. § 19.

129. He is either Creator or creature, take your choice, and, if you will not acknowledge Him as Creator, drop down to the extravagance of placing Him on the level of creatures; I repeat, put aside a distinction which will not hold. Let the Word be excepted from the number of the works, and as Creator be restored to the Father, and be confessed to be Son by nature; or if He be simply a creature, then let Him be assigned that same condition as the rest have one with another, and let them as well as Him be said every one of them to be "a creature, but not as one of the creatures," "offspring or work, but not as one of the works or offsprings,"—for ye say that an offspring is the same as a

CHAP. XVII.

work, writing, "generated or made."[1] But again, you allow that He is "not like one of the creatures." I think so indeed! Star certainly differs from star in glory, and the rest have each of them their mutual differences, when compared together; but what creature is distinguished from others as He is by being their Lord, and having them for His servants, and being an efficient cause of the rest, and bringing them into being instead of being Himself caused? No; all, by the force of their very nature, confess their Framer; as David, when he says in the Psalm, *The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handy work;* and as Zorobabel the wise, *All the earth called upon the Truth, and the heaven blesseth it: all works shake and tremble at it.* And again, who is "the Truth," thus spoken of by Zorobabel, but the Son? for He says, *I am the Truth?* and who is the Framer of the universe but the Word, whose *voice hath gone forth into all lands?* And do you mean to say that He who tells us, *I was by* the Father *disposing*, and who says, *My Father worketh hitherto and I work*, marking by the word *hitherto* His eternal existence in the Father as the Word, who is proper to the Father, who works what the Father works, that He is after all a creature, only not like the other creatures, or that He is in any sense a creature? Nor yet have we got to the bottom of this extravagance. If on the one hand what the

[1] *γεννηθέντα ἢ ποιηθέντα*; as if they were synonymous; in opposition to which the Nicene Creed says, *γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα*. In like manner Arius in his letter to Eusebius uses the words, *πρὶν γεννηθῇ ἤτοι κτισθῇ, ἢ ὁρισθῇ, ἢ θεμελιωθῇ*. Theodor. Hist. p. 750. And to Alexander, *ἀχρόνως γεννηθεὶς καὶ πρὸ αἰώνων κτισθεὶς καὶ θεμελιωθείς*, supr. p. 85. And Eusebius to Paulinus, *κτιστὸν καὶ θεμελιωτὸν καὶ γεννητόν*. Theod., p. 752. The different words profess to be Scriptural, and to explain each other; "created" being in Prov. viii. 22, and "made" in the passages considered in the last two chapters, while "appointed" or "declared" is in Rom. i. 4, and "founded" or "established" in Prov. viii. 23.

Father worketh, the Son worketh also, and what the Son creates that is what the Father creates, yet on the other hand the Son is the Father's work or creature, it follows that the Son created Himself, which is absurd and impossible. And once again; if He be a creative cause, and yet a creature, why may not other creatures be creators too? If a creator may be a creature, creatures may be creators, or is it not rather true, that, as soon as we consider Him a creature, we grant that He has no power to create at all?

130. For how, if as you hold, He is come of nothing, is He able to fashion that nothing into being? or if He, a creature, withal frames a creature, the same will be conceivable in the case of every creature, viz., the power to frame others. And if this pleases you, what is the need of the Word, seeing that things inferior in the scale of being can be brought to be by things superior? or at all events, everything that has been brought into being could have heard in the beginning God's words, *Become* and *be made*, and so would have been framed. But this is not so written, nor could it be. For of things which are brought into being none is an efficient cause, but *all things were made through the Word*, who would not have wrought all things, were He Himself in the number of the creatures, for neither would Angels be able to frame, since they too are creatures (though Valentinus, and Marcion, and Basilides think so, whose copyists you are); nor will the sun, as being a creature, ever make what is not into what is; nor will man fashion man, nor stone devise stone, nor wood give growth to wood. But God is He who fashions man in the womb, and fixes the mountains, and makes wood grow; whereas man, as being capable of science, puts together and shapes that material, and works things that are as he has learned to do; and makes much of it if they are but brought to be, and being conscious of what his nature

CHAP. XVII. is, if he needs aught, knows to ask it of God. If ——— then God wrought and compounded, as man does, out of existing materials, we countenance a Gentile thought, according to which God is an artificer and not a Maker; yet even in that case let the Word work the materials, at the bidding and in the service of God. But if He calls into existence things which existed not, and that by His proper Word, then the Word is not in the number of things non-existing and called into being; or we have to seek another Word, through whom He too was called; for certainly by God's Word the things which-were-not came to be.

131. And whereas all things are from nothing, and are creatures, then if the Son, as they say, is one of the creatures too, and of things which once were not, how does He alone reveal the Father, and none else but He know the Father? For if He, a work, could possibly know the Father, then must the Father be also known by all according to the proportion of the measures of each: for all of them are works as He is. But if it be impossible for things which have had a beginning either to see or to know Him, for the sight and the knowledge of Him surpasses all, (since God Himself says, *No one shall see My face and live*,) yet the Son has declared, *No one knoweth the Father save the Son*, therefore the Word is different from things that have been created, in that He alone knows and alone sees the Father, as He says, *Not that any one hath seen the Father, save He that is from the Father*, and *No one knoweth the Father save the Son*, though Arius think otherwise. How then did He alone know, except that He alone was proper to Him? and how proper, if He were a creature, and not a true Son from Him? (for one must not mind saying often the same thing for religion-sake.) Therefore it is irreligious to think that the Son is only one among all things; and blasphemous and unmean-

ing to call Him "a creature, but not as one of the creatures, and a work, but not as one of the works, an offspring, but not as one of the offsprings;" unmeaning, for why not as one of these, if, as they say, He was not before His generation? for it belongs to the creatures and works not to be before their generation, and to subsist out of nothing, even though these excel those in glory; for that difference of one with another will be found in all creatures, which appears in those which are visible. Ed. Ben. II. § 22—23.

132. It may be added that, if the Son were "creature or work, but not as one of the creatures," as the heretics pretend, merely because of His excelling the rest in glory, it were natural that Scripture should describe and display Him by a comparison in His favour with the other works; for instance, that it should say that He is greater than Archangels, and more honourable than the Thrones, and both brighter than sun and moon, and greater than the heavens. But it does not in fact thus describe Him, but the Father manifests Him to be His own proper and only Son, saying, *Thou art My Son*, and *This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.* Accordingly the Angels ministered unto Him, as being one beside themselves; and they worship Him, not as being greater in glory, but as being some one beyond all the creatures, and beyond themselves, and alone the Father's proper Son according to substance. For if He was worshipped as excelling them in glory, each of things subordinate ought to worship what excels itself. But this is not the case; for creature does not worship creature, but servant worships Lord, and creature God. Thus Peter the Apostle hinders Cornelius who would worship him, saying, *I myself also am a man.* And an Angel, when John would worship him in the Apocalypse, hinders him, saying, *See thou do it not; for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the Prophets, and of them that keep the sayings of this book: worship God.*

CHAP. XVII. Therefore to God alone appertains worship, and this the very Angels know, that though they excel other beings in glory, yet they are creatures all, and not of those who receive worship, but of those who worship the Lord. Thus Manoe, the Father of Samson, wishing to offer sacrifice to the Angel, was thereupon hindered by him, saying, *Offer not to me, but to God.*

133. On the other hand, the Lord is worshipped even by the Angels; for it is written, *Let all the Angels of God worship Him;* and by all the Gentiles, as Esaias says, *The labour of Egypt and merchandise of Ethiopia and of the Sabeans, men of stature, shall come over unto Thee, and they shall be Thine;* and then, *they shall fall down unto Thee, and shall make supplication unto Thee, saying, Surely God is in Thee, and there is none else, there is no God.* And He accepts His disciples' worship, and certifies them who He is, saying, *Call ye Me not Lord and Master? and ye say well, for so I am.* And when Thomas said to Him, *My Lord and my God*, He allows his words, rather accepting him than hindering him. For He is, as the other Prophets declare, and David says in the Psalm, *the Lord of forces, the Lord of Sabaoth*, which is interpreted *the Lord of Armies*, and God true and Almighty, though the Arians burst at the tidings. But He had not been thus worshipped, nor been thus spoken of, were He in the number of creatures. But now, since He is not a creature, but the proper Offspring of the Substance of that God who is worshipped, and His Son by nature, therefore He is worshipped and is believed to be God, and is Lord of armies, and Sovereign, and Almighty, as the Father is; for He has said Himself, *All things that the Father hath are Mine.* For it belongs to the Son to have the things of the Father, and to be such that the Father is seen in Him, and that through Him all things were made, and that the salvation of all comes to pass and consists in Him.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Answer to objections from Scripture; sixthly, Introductory to Proverbs viii. 22.

134. And here it were well to ask them also this question, for a still clearer refutation of their heresy:—Wherefore, when all things are creatures, and all are brought into consistence from nothing, and the Son Himself, according to them, is creature and work, and one of those things which once were not, wherefore has God made *all things through Him* alone, *and without Him was made not one thing?* or why is it, when *all things* are spoken of, that no one thinks the Son is signified in the number *all*, but only things that come to be; whereas when Scripture speaks of the Word, it does not understand Him as being in the number of *all*, but ranks Him with the Father, as Him in whom providence and salvation for *all* are wrought and effected by the Father, though all things surely might at that very same command have come to be, at which, they say, He was brought into being by God alone? For God is not wearied by commanding, nor is His strength unequal to the making of all things, that He should alone create the only Son, and need His service and aid for the framing of the rest. For He lets nothing stand over which He wills to be done; but He has willed only, and all things subsisted, and no one *hath resisted His will.* Why then were not all things brought into being by God alone at the same command at which the Son came into being? Or let them tell us, why did all things through Him come to be, who was but brought into being Himself. Ed. Ben. ii. § 23–24.

135. However,[2] they say in answer, that, on God's deter-

[2] Vid. supr. p. 22; vid. also a similar argument in Epiphanius Hær. 76, p. 951, but the arguments of Ath. in these Orations are so generally adopted by the succeeding Fathers, that it is impossible and needless to enumerate the instances of agreement.

CH. XVIII. mining to create this finite Nature, "when He saw ——— that it could not endure the touch of His immediate hand, and its creation by means of It, He makes and creates first and alone one, and calls Him Son and Word, that, through Him as an intermediate, all things may thereupon be brought to be." This they not only have said, but they have been bold enough to put it into writing, namely, Eusebius, Arius, and Asterius the sacrificer. Yet if they shall assign the toil of making all other creatures as the reason why God made the Son only, the whole creation will cry out against them as saying unworthy things of God; and Esaias too, who has said in Scripture, *the Everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary: there is no searching of His understanding.* But if, again, God made the Son alone, as not deigning to make the rest, but committed them to the Son as an assistant, this on the other hand is unworthy of God, for in Him there is no pride. Nay, the Lord reproves the thought when He says, *Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing?* and *not one of them shall fall on the ground without your Father who is in heaven.* And again, *Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment? Behold the fowls of the air, for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them; are ye not much better than they? Which of you, by taking thought, can add one cubit unto his stature? And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: and yet I say unto you, that even Solomon, in all his glory, was not arrayed like one of these. Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall He not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?* If then it be not unworthy of God to exercise His providence, even

down to things so small as a hair of the head, and a sparrow and the grass of the field, also it was not unworthy of Him in the first instance to make them. For what things are the subject of His providence, of those He is Maker, that is, by means of His own proper Word. Nay, a worse absurdity lies before the men who thus speak; for they distinguish between the creatures and their framing; and consider the latter the work of the Father, the creatures the work of the Son; but, if so, either all things must be brought to be by the Father with the Son, or at least if all that has a beginning comes into being through the Son, we must not call Him one of those created things. Ed. Ben. ii. § 24–26.

136. Next, they may be exposed thus:—if even the Word be of created nature, how, whereas this nature is too feeble to sustain God's own handiwork, could He alone of all endure to be made by the Ingenerate and untempered Substance of God, as ye say? for it follows either that, if He could endure it, all could endure it, or, it being endurable by none, it was not endurable even by the Word for you say that He is one of things which have a beginning. And again, if because created nature could not endure to be God's own handiwork, there arose need of a mediator, it clearly follows that, the Word having come to be, and being a creature, there is need of a medium in His framing also, since He too is of that same nature which does not admit of being made by God without a medium. But if some being as a medium be found for Him, then again a fresh mediator is needed for that second, and thus tracing back and following out by reasoning, we shall invent a vast crowd of accumulating mediators; and thus it will be impossible that the creation should subsist, as ever wanting an intermediate, and that medium being unable to come into being without another previous mediator; for all of them will be of that created nature which does not, as ye say, endure to be the workmanship of God alone.

CH. XVIII. How abundant is that folly, which obliges them to hold that what has already come into being, admits not of that coming! Or perhaps they opine that they have not even yet come to be, as still seeking their mediator; for, on the ground of their so impious and futile notion, what really is would not have subsistence, for want of the intermediate.

137. But again they allege this:—"Behold, through Moses too did He lead the people from Egypt, and through him He gave the Law, yet he was a man; so that it is possible for like to be brought into being by like." They should veil their face when they say this, to save their much shame. For Moses was not sent to frame the world, nor to call into being things which were not, nor to fashion men like himself, but only to be the minister of parlance to the people and to King Pharaoh. And this is a very different thing, for to minister belongs to things made as of servants, but to frame and to create is of God alone, and of His proper Word and His Wisdom. Wherefore, in the matter of framing, we shall find none but God's Word; for *all things are made in Wisdom*, and *without the Word was made not one thing*. But as regards ministrations there are, not one only, but many out of the whole number, whomever the Lord will send. For there are many Archangels, many Thrones, and Powers, and Dominions, thousands of thousands, and myriads of myriads, standing before Him, ministering and ready to be sent. And many Prophets, and Twelve Apostles, and Paul. And Moses himself was not alone, but Aaron with him, and next other seventy were filled with the Holy Ghost. And Moses was succeeded by Jesus the Son of Nave, and he by the Judges, and they by, not one, but by a number of Kings. If then the Son were a creature and one of things that had a beginning, there would have been many such sons, in order that God might have many

such ministers, just as there is a multitude of those others. But if this is not to be seen, for the creatures are many, but the Word is one, any one will collect from this, that the Son differs from all, and is not on a level with the creatures, but is proper to the Father. Hence many Words there are not, but one only Word of the one Father, and one Image of the one God. ED. BEN. ii. § 26—28.

138. "But behold," they say, "there is but one sun and one earth." Let them maintain, senseless as they are, that there is one water and one fire, and then they may be told that everything that is brought into being is one in its own substance, but for the ministry and service committed to it, by itself it is not adequate nor sufficient alone. For God said, *Let there be lights in the firmament of heaven, to give light upon the earth, and to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs and for seasons and for days and years.* And then He says, *And God made two great lights, the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: He made the stars also. And God set them in the firmament of the heaven, to give light upon the earth, and to rule over the day and over the night.* Behold there are many lights, and not the sun only, nor the moon only, but each is one in substance, and yet the service of all is one and common; and what each lacks is supplied by the other, and the office of lighting is performed by all. Thus the sun has power to shine throughout the day and no more; and the moon through the night; and the stars together with them accomplish the seasons and years, and become for signs, each according to the need that calls for it. Thus too the earth is not for all things, but for the fruits only, and to be a ground to tread on for the living things that inhabit it. And the firmament is to divide between waters and waters, and is a place to set the stars in. So also fire and water, with other things, have been brought into being to be the constituent parts of bodies; and in

CH. XVIII. short no one thing is alone, but all things that are made, as if members of each other, make up as it were one body, namely, the world. If then they thus conceive of the Son, they deserve a good pelting, as considering the Word to be a part of this universe, and a part insufficient without the rest for the service committed to Him. But if this be manifestly impious, let them acknowledge that the Word is not in the number of things which have been made, but is the sole and proper Word of the Father, and of those things the Framer.

139. "But," they have said, "though He is a creature and has been brought into being, yet as from a master and artificer has He learned to frame things, and thus has ministered to God who taught Him." For thus the Sophist Asterius, having learned to deny the Lord, has dared to write, not observing the absurdity which follows. For if framing a universe be a thing to be taught, let them beware lest they say that it is not by nature but by skill that God Himself is a Framer, so as to admit of His losing the art. Besides, if the Wisdom of God attained to it by definite teaching, how is it still Wisdom, when it needs lessons? and what was it before it learned? For it was not Wisdom if it needed teaching; it was surely but some empty thing, and not Wisdom in substance, but from improving itself it had the name of Wisdom, and will be only so long Wisdom as it can retain what it has learned. For what has been acquired not by any nature, but from learning, admits of being at one time unlearned. But to speak thus of the Word of God is not the part of Christians, but of Greeks. For if the power of framing a world accrues to any one from teaching, these insensate men are ascribing jealousy and weakness to God; jealousy, in that He has not taught many beings how to frame, so that there may be around Him, as Archangels and Angels many, so world-framers many; and weakness, in that He could not make by

Himself, but needed a fellow-worker, or under-worker; and yet creation must begin with God alone, even according to their showing, if, as they say, the Son is a creature, and so there was no one else to make Him but God. But God is deficient in nothing: perish the thought! for He has said Himself, *I am full.* Nor did the Word become Framer of the universe from teaching; but being the Image and Wisdom of the Father, He works what appertains to the Father. Nor hath He made the Son for the making of things generate; for behold, though the Son exists, still the Father is seen to work, as the Lord Himself says, *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.* If, however, as you say, the Son came into being for the purpose of making the things which were made after Him, and yet the Father is seen to work even after the Son, you must hold even in this light the making of such a Son to be superfluous. Besides, why, when He would create us, does He seek for the intermediate at all, as if His will did not suffice to constitute whatever seemed good to Him? Yet the Scriptures say, *He hath done whatsoever pleased Him*, and *Who hath resisted His will?* And if His mere will is sufficient for the framing of all things, you make the office of a middle power superfluous; for your instance of Moses, and the sun and the moon, has been shown not to hold. Ed. Ben. ii. § 28—30.

140. And here again is an argument to silence you. You say that God, willing the creation of that nature which has a beginning, and deliberating concerning it, designs and creates the Son, that through Him He may frame us; now, if so, consider how great an impiety you have dared to utter. First, because the Son thereby appears rather to have been for us brought to be, than we for Him; for we were not created for Him, but He is made for us; so that He owes thanks to us, not we to Him, as the woman to the man. *For the man*, says Scripture, *was not created for the woman, but the woman for the man.* Therefore as *the*

CH. XVIII. *man is the image and glory of God, and the woman the glory of the man*, so we are made God's image and for His glory; but the Son is our image, and exists for our glory. And we were brought into being that we might be; but God's Word was made, as you must hold, not that He might be, but as an instrument for our need, so that not we from Him, but He is constituted from our need. Are not men who even conceive such thoughts, more than insensate? For if for us the Word was made, He has not precedence of us with God; for God in that case did not take counsel about us having Him within Him, but having us in Himself, counselled as they say concerning His own Word. But if so, perchance the Father had not even a will for the Son at all; for not as having a will for Him, did He create Him, but with a will for us, He formed Him for our sake; for He designed Him after designing us; so that, according to these impious men, henceforth the Son, who was made as an instrument, is superfluous, now that they are made for whom He was created.

141. But if the Son alone was made by God alone, because He could endure it, but we, because we could not, were made by the Word, why does He not first take counsel about the Word, who could endure His making, instead of taking counsel about us? or why does He not make more of Him who was strong than of us who were weak? or why, making Him first, does He not counsel about Him first? or why, counselling about us first, does He not make us first, His will being sufficient for the constitution of all things? But He creates Him first, yet counsels first about us; and He wills us before the Mediator; and when He wills to create us, and counsels about us, He calls us creatures; but Him, whom He frames for us, He calls Son and proper Heir. But we, for whose sake He made Him, ought rather to be called sons; or certainly He, who is His Son, is rather the object of His previous

thoughts and of His will, for whom He makes us all. Such the bile, such the vomit of the heretics.[3] ED. BEN. ii. § 30—31.

CHAPTER XIX.

Answer to objections from Scripture; sixthly, Introduction to Proverbs viii. 22.

142. BUT the sentiment of Truth in this matter must not be hidden, but must have high utterance. For the Word of God was not made for us, but rather we for Him, and *in Him all things were created.* Nor, because we were weak, was He made by the Father alone, as able to endure this, that He might frame us by means of Him as an instrument; perish the thought! it is not so. For though it had seemed good to God not to make creatures, still had *the Word* been no less *with God*, and the Father in Him. At the same time, created things could not without the Word be brought to be; hence they were made through Him—and reasonably. For since the Son is the Word proper and natural to God's substance, and is from Him, and in Him, as He

[3] ἔμετοι καὶ ναυτίαι; ναυτίαι sea-sickness; as to ἔμετοι, (for which vid. supra. p. 86; also Disc. p. 214, n. 66, &c.) the word, according to Cressol de Theatr. Rhet. iii. 11, has a technical meaning, when used of disputation or oratory, and denotes *extempore* delivery as contrasted with compositions on which pains have been bestowed. And this agrees with what Athan. frequently observes about the Arians, as saying what came uppermost to serve their purpose, with no care of consistency. Thus St. Greg. Nyss. says of Eunomius, "All such things were poured forth, ἐπημέσθη, by this writer without reflection (διανοίας)," in Eunom. ix. p. 250, d. And in a parallel case Synesius, "He does not cherish the word within who is forced to pour forth daily, ἐμεῖν." Dion. p. 56, ed. 1612. And Epictetus, in a somewhat similar sense, "There is great danger of pouring forth straightway, what one has not digested." Enchirid. 46; vid. also Dissert. iii. 21. A different allusion of course is contained in the word ἐξέραμα, which Athan. sometimes uses, and which is taken from 2 Pet. ii. 22.

CHAP. XIX. said Himself, the creatures could not have come to be, except through Him. For as the light enlightens all things by its radiance, and without its radiance nothing would be illuminated, so also the Father, as by a hand, in the Word wrought all things, and without Him makes nothing. For instance, God said, as Moses relates, *Let there be light*, and *Let the waters be gathered together*, and *let the dry land appear*, and *Let us make man;* as also holy David in the Psalm, *He spake and it was done; He commanded and it stood fast*, And He spoke, not that, as in the case of men, some under-worker might hear, and learning the will of Him who spoke might go away and do it; for this is what is proper to creatures, but it is unseemly so to think or speak of the Word. For the Word of God is Framer and executes, and He is the Father's Will. Hence it is that divine Scripture says not that some one heard and answered, what was to be the manner or nature of the things which He wished made; but God only said, *Let it become*, and Scripture adds, *And it became;* for what He thought good and counselled, that forthwith the Word began and put in execution.

143. For when God commands others, whether the Angels, or converses with Moses, or promises Abraham, then the hearer answers; and the one says, *Whereby shall I know?* and the other, *Commission some one else;* and again, *If they ask me, What is His Name, what shall I say to them?* and the Angel said to Zacharias, *Thus saith the Lord;* and he asked the Lord, *O Lord of hosts, how long wilt Thou not have mercy on Jerusalem?* and waits to hear *good words and comfortable.* For each of these has in it the Mediator Word, and the Wisdom of God, which makes known the will of the Father. But when that Word Himself works and creates, then there is no questioning and answering, for the Father is in Him and the Word in the Father; but it suffices to will, and the work is done; so that the phrase *He said* is a

token of the will for our sake, and *It was so* denotes the work which is done through the Word and the Wisdom, in which Wisdom also is the Will of the Father. And the meaning of *God said* is explained to us in *the Word*, for, He says, *Thou hast made all things in Wisdom;* and *By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made;* and *There is one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by Him.* Ed. Ben. ii. § 31—32.

144. It is plain from this that not with us are the Arians fighting about their heresy; but while they put us forward, their real fight is against the Godhead. For if the voice were ours which says, *This is My Son*, small were our complaint of them; but if it is the Father's voice, and the disciples heard it, and the Son too says of Himself, *Before all the mountains He begat Me*, are they not fighting against God, as the giants in story, having their tongue, as the Psalmist says, a sharp sword for impiety? For they neither have feared the voice of the Father, nor reverenced the Saviour's words, nor trusted the sacred writers, one of whom writes, *Who being the Brightness of His glory and the expression of His subsistence*, and *Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God;* and another says in the Psalm, *With Thee is the well of life, and in Thy Light shall we see Light*, and *Thou hast made all things in Wisdom;* and the Prophets say, *And the Word of the Lord came to me;* and John, *In the beginning was the Word;* and Luke, *As they delivered them unto us which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word;* and as David again says, *He sent His Word and healed them.* All these passages proscribe on every side the Arian heresy, and signify the eternity of the Word, and that He is not foreign but proper to the Father's Substance. For when saw any one light without radiance? or who dares to say that the impress can be different from the subsistence? or has not a man lost his mind himself who even entertains the thought that God was ever Word-less and Wisdom-less?

CHAP. XIX. 145. For such illustrations and such images has Scripture proposed, that considering the inability of human nature to comprehend God, we might be able to form ideas even from these, however poorly and dimly, as far as is attainable. And as the creation is all-sufficient for the knowledge of the being of a God and a Providence *(for by the greatness and beauty of the creatures proportionally the Maker of them is seen)*, and we learn from them without asking for voices, but hearing the Scriptures we believe, and surveying the very order and the harmony of all things, we acknowledge that He is Maker and Lord and God of all, and apprehend His marvellous providence and governance over all things; so in like manner about the Son's Godhead, what has been above said suffices, and it becomes superfluous, or rather it is very mad to doubt about it, or to ask in an heretical way, How can the Son be from eternity? or how can He be from the Father's Substance, yet not a part? since what is said to be of another, is a part of him; and what is divided, is not whole. We have already shown the shallowness of such questions, but the exact consideration of these passages themselves and the force of these illustrations will serve still further to expose them.

146. For we see that a man's reason continues, and is from him and belongs to his substance whose reason it is, and does not admit a before and an after. So again we see that the radiance from the sun is proper to it, and the sun's substance is not divided or impaired; but its substance is whole, and its radiance perfect and whole, yet without impairing the substance of light, but as a true offspring from it. We understand in like manner that the Son is not from without, but begotten from the Father, and while the Father remains whole, the Impress of His Subsistence is everlasting, and preserves the Father's likeness and unvarying Image, so that he who sees Him, sees in Him the Subsistence too of which He is the Impress. And from

the action of the Impress we understand the true Godhead of the Subsistence, as the Saviour Himself teaches when He says, *The Father who dwelleth in Me, He doeth the works* which I do; and *I and the Father are one*, and *I in the Father and the Father in Me.* Therefore let this Christ-opposing heresy attempt first to mutilate the examples found in things created, and say, "Once the sun was without his radiance," or, "Radiance is not proper to the substance of light," or, "It is indeed proper, but it is a part of light by mutilation;" and then let it mutilate Reason, and pronounce that it is foreign to Mind, or that once it was not, or that it is not proper to its substance, or that it is by mutilation a part of mind. And so of His Impress and the Light and the Power, let it mutilate these as in the case of Reason and Radiance; and instead let it imagine what it will. But if such extravagance be impossible even for them, are they not greatly beside themselves, presumptuously intruding into what is higher than created things and their own nature, and essaying impossibilities? Ed. Ben. ii. § 32—34.

147. For if, in the case of these created and bodily things, offsprings are found which are not parts of the substances from which they are, and subsist without injury to them, or impairing the substances of their originals, are they not mad again in seeking and conjecturing parts and passions in the instance of the immaterial and true God, and predicating mutilation of Him who is beyond passion and change, thereby to perplex the ears of the simple and to pervert them from the Truth? for who hears of a son but conceives of that which belongs to the father's substance? who heard, in his first catechising, that God has a Son and has made all things by His proper Word, but understood it in that sense in which we now mean it? who, on the rise of this odious heresy of the Arians, was not at once startled at what he heard, as strange, and a second sowing

CHAP. XIX. beside that Word which has been sown from the beginning? For what is sown in every soul from the beginning is that God has a Son, the Word, the Wisdom, the Power, that is, His Image and Radiance; from which it at once follows that He is always; that He is from the Father; that He is like Him; that He is the eternal offspring of His substance; and there is no idea involved in these of creature or work. But when the man who is an enemy, while men were sleeping, made a second sowing, of "He is a creature," and "There was once when He was not," and "How can it be?" thenceforth the wicked heresy of Christ's enemies rose as tares, and forthwith, as bereft of every orthodox thought, as robbers, they are going about[4] and venture to say, "How can the Son always exist with the Father?" for men come of men and are sons, after a time; and the father is thirty years old when the son begins to be, being begotten; and in short of every son of man it is true that he was not before his "generation." And again they whisper, "How can the Son be Word, or the Word be God's Image? for the word of men is composed of syllables, and only signifies the speaker's will, and then is over and is lost."

148. They then afresh, as if forgetting the proofs which have been already urged against them, thus argue. But the word of truth confutes them as follows:—If they were disputing concerning any man, then let them exercise reason in this human way, both concerning his word and his son; but if concerning God who created man, no longer let them entertain human thoughts, but others which are

[4] περιεργάζονται, Edd. Col. Ben. and Patav. This seems an error of the press for περιέρχονται. The Latin translates, "circumire cœperunt." Vid. supr. Nic. p. 29, note, also περιέρχονται, infr. Disc. n. 192, init. p. 329, (Orat. ii. § 62,) ἄνω καὶ κάτω περιΐοντες, chap. 30 init. ἄνω καὶ κάτω περῒοντες θρυλοῦσι, Apol. contr. Ar. § 11 init. περιτρέχουσι, de Fug. § 2, περιφέρουσι, infr. § 43, περιτροχάζειν, Theod. Hist. i. 3, p. 730. Vid. also περιπετῆι, i. Petr. v. 8. For περιεργία, &c., vid. infr. Disc. ch. 24 and ch. 29.

above human nature. For such as is the parent, such of necessity is the offspring; and such as is the Word's Father, such must be also His Word. Now man, begotten in time, in time also himself begets the child; and whereas from nothing he came into existence, therefore his word also is over and continues not. But God is not as man, as Scripture has said; but is existing and is ever; therefore also His Word is existing and is everlastingly with the Father, as radiance from light. And man's word is composed of syllables, and neither lives nor operates any thing, but is only significant of the speaker's intention, and does but go forth and go by, no more to appear, since it was not at all before it was spoken; wherefore, I say, the word of man neither lives nor operates anything, nor in short is man. And this happens to it, as I said before, because man who begets it has his nature out of nothing. But God's Word is not merely pronounced,[5] as one may say, nor a sound of accents, nor by His Son is meant His command; but as radiance from light, so is He perfect Offspring from perfect. Hence He is God also, as being God's Image;' for *the Word was God*, says Scripture. And man's words avail not for operation; hence man works not by means of words but of hands, for they have existence, and man's words have no stay. But the *Word of God*, as the Apostle says, *is living and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in His sight; but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of Him with whom we have to do.* He is then Framer of all, *and without Him was made not one thing*, nor can anything be made without Him. ED. BEN. ii. § 34—35.

149. Nor must we ask why the Word of God is not such

[5] Vid. App. προφορικός.

CHAP. XIX. as our word, considering God is not such as we, ——— as has been before said; nor again is it right to seek how the Word is from God, or how He is God's Radiance, or how God begets, and what is the manner of His begetting. For a man must be beside himself to venture on such points; since a thing ineffable and proper to God's nature, and known to Him alone and to the Son, this he demands to have explained in words. It is all one as if they sought where God is, and how God is, and of what nature the Father is. But as to ask such questions is impious, and argues an ignorance of God, so it is not permitted to venture such questions concerning the generation of the Son of God, nor to measure God and His Wisdom by our own nature and infirmity. Nor is a person at liberty on that account to swerve in his thoughts from the truth, nor, if any one is perplexed in such inquiries, ought he to disbelieve what is written. For it is better in perplexity to be silent and believe, than to disbelieve on account of the perplexity: for he who is perplexed may in some way obtain mercy, because, though he has questioned, he has yet kept quiet; but when a man is led by his perplexity into forming for himself doctrines which beseem not, and utters what is unworthy of God, such daring incurs a sentence without mercy. For in such perplexities divine Scripture is able to afford him some relief, so as to take rightly what is written, and to dwell upon a human word as an illustration: that, as it is proper to us and is from us, and not a work external to us, so also God's Word belongs to Him and is from Him, and is not a thing made; and yet is not like the word of man, or else we must suppose God to be man.

150. For observe, many and various are men's words which pass away day by day; because those that come first continue not, but vanish. Now this happens because their authors are men, and have their fit seasons which

pass away, and motive thoughts which are successive; and what strikes them first and second, that they utter; so that they have many words, and yet after them all nothing at all remaining; for the speaker ceases, and his word forthwith perishes. But God's Word is one and the same, and, as it is written, *The Word of God endureth for ever*, not changed, not antecedent or posterior to Itself, but existing the same always. For it was fitting, whereas God is One, that His Image should be One also, and His Word One, and One His Wisdom. Wherefore I am in wonder how, whereas God is One, these men introduce, after their private notions, many images and wisdoms and words, and say that the Father's proper and natural Word is other than the Son, by whom He even made the Son, and that He who is really Son is but notionally called Word, as vine, and way, and door, and tree of life; and that He is called Wisdom also only in name, the proper and true Wisdom of the Father, which co-exists ingenerately with Him, being other than the Son, by which He even made the Son, and named Him Wisdom as partaking of it. ED. BEN. ii. § 36—37.

151. To this they have not only given speech, but Arius has put it into form in his Thalia, and the Sophist Asterius has written, what we have stated above, as follows: "Blessed Paul said not that he preached Christ, the Power of God or the Wisdom of God, but without the addition of the article, *God's Power* and *God's Wisdom*, thus preaching that the proper power of God Himself which is natural to Him, and co-existent in Him ingenerately, is something else generative indeed of Christ, and creative of the whole world, concerning which he teaches in his Epistle to the Romans thus,—*The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal Power and Godhead.* For as no one would say that the Godhead there mentioned was Christ and not the Father Himself, so, as I think, *His*

CHAP. XIX. *eternal Power and Godhead* also is not the Only Begotten Son, but the Father who begat Him." And he teaches that there is another power and wisdom of God, manifested through Christ. And shortly after, the same Asterius says, "However, His eternal power and wisdom, which Truth argues to be unoriginate and ingenerate, this certainly must be one and the same. For there are many wisdoms which are one by one created by Him, of whom Christ is the first-born and only-begotten; all however equally depend on their possessor. And all the powers are rightly called His who created and uses them: as the Prophet says that the locust, which came to be a divinely inflicted punishment of human sins, was called by God Himself not only a power, but a great power; and blessed David in very many of the Psalms invites, not the Angels alone, but the Powers to praise God."

152. Now are they not worthy of all hatred for merely uttering this? for if, as they hold, His Sonship does not mean that He is begotten of the Father and belongs to His Substance, then as they call Him Word only because of things rational, and Wisdom because of things gifted with wisdom, and Power because of things gifted with power, surely in like manner He must be named Son as one of a company, because of those who are made sons; and perhaps because there are things existing, He has the gift of existence, that is in our notions only.[6] And then after all what is He really? for He is none of these Himself, if they are but His names: and He has but a semblance of being, and is decorated with these names[7] for our sakes. But rather this is some devil's recklessness, or worse, to be willing enough that they should truly subsist themselves, yet to think that God's Word is but in

[6] Vid. Append. *ἐπίνοια*.

[7] Vid. *ὀνόματα*.

name. Is not this portentous, to say that Wisdom co-exists with the Father, yet to deny that this is the Christ, but to hold that, whereas there are many created powers and wisdoms, one of them is the Lord, whom they go on to compare to the caterpillar and locust? and are they not unscrupulous, who, when they hear us say that the Word of God co-exists with the Father, forthwith mutter, "Are you not speaking of two Ingenerates?" although in speaking themselves of "His Ingenerate Wisdom," they do not see that they have already incurred themselves the charge which they so rashly urge against us. Moreover, what folly is there in that thought of theirs, that the Ingenerate Wisdom co-existing with God is God Himself! for what co-exists does not co-exist with itself, but with some one else, as the Evangelists say of the Lord, that He was "in company with" His disciples; for He was not together with Himself, but with His disciples;—unless indeed they would say that God is of a compound nature, having wisdom a constituent or complement of His Substance, ingenerate as well as Himself, which moreover they pretend to be the framer of the world, that so they may deprive the Son of the framing of it. For there is nothing they would not maintain, sooner than hold true doctrine concerning the Lord. Ed. Ben. ii. § 37—39.

153. For where at all have they found in divine Scripture, or from whom have they heard, that there is another Word and another Wisdom besides this Son, that they should frame to themselves such a doctrine? True, indeed it is written, *Are not My words like fire and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?* and in the Proverbs, *I will make known My words unto you;* but these are precepts and commands, which God has spoken to the sacred writers through His proper and only true Word, concerning which the Psalmist said, *I have refrained my feet from every evil way, that I may keep Thy words.* Such words

CHAP. XIX. accordingly the Saviour signifies to be distinct from Himself, when He says in His own person, *The words which I have spoken unto you.* For certainly such words as these are not offsprings, nor was it such words as these that framed the world, nor were they so many images of the One God, nor so many who have become men for us, nor as if from many such there were one who has become flesh, as John says; but it is on the ground of there being one only Word of God that those good tidings are heralded by John, *The Word was made flesh*, and *all things were made by Him.*

154. Wherefore of Him alone, our Lord Jesus Christ, and of His oneness with the Father, are written and set forth the testimonies, both of the Father signifying that the Son is One, and of the sacred writers, who have received this doctrine and declare that the Word is One, and that He is Only-Begotten. And His works also are set before us; for all things, visible and invisible, have been brought into being through Him, and *without Him was made not one thing.* But concerning some one or any one else they have not a thought, not framing to themselves words or wisdoms, as to which neither name nor deed are signified by Scripture, but are spoken of by these men only. For it is simply their invention and Christ-opposing surmise, and they wrest the true sense of the name of the Word and the Wisdom, and framing to themselves others, they deny the true Word of God, and the real and only Wisdom of the Father, and thereby rival the Manichees. For they too, when they behold the works of God, deny Him who is the only and true God, and frame to themselves another, whom they can show neither by his work, nor in any testimony drawn from the divine oracles. If then neither in the divine oracles is found another wisdom, supposing this Son is put aside, nor from the fathers have we heard of any such, yet they have confessed and written of the Wisdom co-existing with the Father ingenerately, proper to

Him, and the Framer of the world, this Framing Wisdom must be the Son, who therefore, even according to them, will be eternally co-existent with the Father. For He is Framer of all, as it is written, *In Wisdom hast Thou made them all.*

155. Nay, Asterius himself,[8] as if forgetting what he wrote before, afterwards, in Caiaphas's fashion, involuntarily, when urging the Greeks, instead of naming many wisdoms, or the caterpillar, confesses but one, in these words: "God the Word is one, but many are the things rational; and one is the substance and nature of Wisdom, but many are the things wise and beautiful." And soon afterwards he says again: "Who are they whom they honour with the title of God's children? for they will not say that they too are words, nor maintain that there are many wisdoms. For it is not possible, whereas the Word is one, and Wisdom has been set forth as one, to distribute to the multitude of children the Substance of the Word, and to bestow on them the appellation of Wisdom." It is not then at all wonderful that the Arians should battle with the truth, when they have collisions with their own principles and conflict with each other, at one time saying that there are many wisdoms, at another maintaining one; at one time classing Wisdom with the caterpillar, at another saying that it co-exists with the Father and is proper to Him; now that the Father alone is ingenerate, and then again that His Wisdom and His Power are ingenerate also. And they battle with us for saying that the Word of God is ever, yet forget their own doctrines, and say themselves that Wisdom co-exists with God ingenerately. Thus they deny the true Wisdom, and invent one which exists not, as the Manichees, who make to themselves another God, after denying Him that is.

156. But let the other heresies and the Manichees also

[8] Vid. Append. *Asterius.*

CHAP. XIX. know that the Father of the Christ is One, and ——— is Lord and Maker of the creation through His proper Word. And let the Ariomaniacs know in particular, that the Word of God is One, being the only Son proper and genuine from His Substance, and having with His Father the oneness of Godhead indivisible, as we have said many times, being taught it by the Saviour Himself. Since, were it not so, wherefore through Him does the Father create, and in Him reveal Himself to whom He will, and illuminate them? or why too in the baptismal consecration is the Son named together with the Father? For if they say that the Father is not all-sufficient, then their answer is impious; but if He be, for this alone is lawful to say, what is the need of the Son whether for framing the worlds, or for the Holy Bath? And what fellowship is there between creature and Creator? or why is a thing, that is made, classed with the Maker in the consecration of all of us? or why, as you hold, is faith in one Creator and in one creature delivered to us? for if it was that we might be joined to the Godhead, what need of the creature? but if that we might be united to the Son, Himself a creature, superfluous, according to you, is this naming of the Son in Baptism, for God who made Him a Son is able to make us sons also. Besides, if the Son be a creature, the nature of rational creatures being one, no help will come to creatures from a creature, since all need that grace which comes from God.

157. We said a few words just now on the fitness that all things should have been made by Him; but since the course of the discussion has led us also to mention Holy Baptism, it is necessary to state, as I think and believe, that the Son is named with the Father, not as if the Father were not all-sufficient, nor as if without meaning, and by accident; but, since He is God's Word and proper Wisdom, and, being His Radiance, is ever with the Father,

therefore it is impossible, if the Father bestows grace, that He should not give it in the Son, for the Son is in the Father as the radiance in the light. For, not as if in need, but as a Father, God in His own Wisdom hath founded the earth, and made all things in the Word which is from Him, and in the Son confirms the Holy Bath. For where the Father is, there is the Son, and where the light, there the radiance; and as, what the Father worketh, He worketh through the Son, and the Lord Himself says, "What I see the Father do, that I do also," so also when baptism is given, whom the Father baptises, him the Son baptises; and whom the Son baptises, he is consecrated in the Holy Ghost. And again as when the sun shines, one might say that the radiance illuminates, for the light is one and indivisible, nor can it be separated off, so where the Father is or is named, there plainly is the Son also; and is the Father named in Baptism? then must the Son be named with Him. Therefore, when He made His promise to the sacred writers, He thus spoke: *I and the Father will come and make Our abode in him;* and again, *that, as I and Thou are One so they may be one in Us.* And the grace given is one, given from the Father in the Son, as Paul writes in every Epistle, *Grace unto you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.* For the light must be with the ray, and the radiance must be contemplated together with its own light. Ed. Ben. ii. § 41—42.

158. Whence the Jews, in that they deny the Son as well as these men, have not the Father either; for they first left the *Fountain of Wisdom*, as Baruch reproaches them, and then put from them the Wisdom springing from it, our Lord Jesus Christ, (for *Christ*, says the Apostle, is *God's Power and God's Wisdom*,) when they said, *We have no king but Cæsar.* The Jews then have the penal award of their denial; for their city as well as their reasoning came to nought. And these two hazard the fulness of the mystery,

CHAP. XIX. I mean Baptism; for if the consecration is given to us into the Name of Father and Son, and they do not confess a true Father, because they deny what is from Him and is like[9] His Substance, and deny also the true Son, and name for themselves another of their own framing as created out of nothing, is not the rite administered by them altogether empty and unprofitable, making a show, but in reality being no help towards piety? For the Arians do not baptise into Father and Son, but into Creator and creature, and into Maker and work. And as a creature is other than the Son, so the Baptism, which is supposed to be given by them, is other than the truth, though they pretend to name the Name of the Father and the Son because of the words of Scripture. For not he who simply says, "O Lord," gives Baptism; but he who with the Name has also the right faith. On this account therefore our Saviour also did not simply command to baptise; but first says, *Teach;* and then "Baptise into the Name of Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost;" that the right faith might follow upon learning, and together with faith might come the consecration of Baptism.

159. There are many other heresies too, which use the words only, but without orthodoxy (as I have said,) and the faith which saves, and in consequence the water which they administer is unprofitable, as deficient in a pious meaning; so that he who is sprinkled by them is rather polluted by impiety than redeemed.[10] So Gentiles also, though the name of God is on their lips, incur the charge of Atheism, because they know not the real and very God, the Father

[9] Vid. supr. note on p. 181.

[10] The *primâ facie* sense of n. 158, 159 is certainly unfavourable to the validity of heretical baptism; vid. the subject considered at length in Note G. on Tertullian, O. Tr. vol. i. p. 280, also Coust. Pont. Rom. Ep. p. 227. Voss. de Bapt. Disp. 19 and 20. Forbes, Instruct. Theol. x. 2, 3, and 12. Hooker's Eccl. Pol. v. 62, § 5—11. On Arian Baptism in particular vid. Jablonski's Diss. Opusc. t. iv. p. 113. Vid. for a Catholic explanation, Nat. Alex. sæc. 3. I. H. Sbalarea Bapt. Hær.

of our Lord Jesus Christ. So Manichees and Phrygians, and the disciples of the Samosatene, though using the Names, nevertheless are heretics, and the Arians follow in the same course, though they read the words of Scripture, and use the Names, yet they too mock those who receive the rite from them, being more impious than the other heresies, and advancing beyond them, and making them seem innocent by their own recklessness of speech. For these other heresies lie against the truth in some certain respect, either erring concerning the Lord's Body, as if He did not take flesh of Mary, or as if He simply did not die, or become man, but only appeared, and was not truly, and seemed to have a body when He had not, and seemed to have the shape of man, as visions in a dream; but the Arians are openly impious against the Father Himself. For hearing from the Scriptures that His Godhead is represented in the Son as in an image, they blaspheme, saying that it is a creature, and everywhere concerning that Image they carry about with them the mocking word, "He was not," as mud in a wallet,[1] and spit it forth as serpents their venom.[2] Then, whereas their doctrine is nauseous to all men, forthwith, as a support against its fall, they prop up the heresy with human patronage,[3] that the simple, at the sight or even by the fear of this, may overlook the mischief of their perversity.

Ed. Ben. ii. § 42—43.

160. Right indeed is it to pity their dupes; well is it to weep over them, for that they sacrifice their true interest for the present prospect of ease and pleasure, and thereby

[1] Instead of bread, a proverb.

[2] ὡς ὄφις τὸν ἰόν, also Ep. Æg. 19, Hist. Ar. 66. And so Arians are dogs (with allusion to 2 Pet. ii. 22), Hist. Ar. 29, lions, Hist. Ar. 11, wolves, Ap. c. Arian. 49, &c., &c. In many of these instances the allusion is to Scripture. On names given to heretics in general, vid. the Alphabetum bestialitatis hæreticæ ex Patrum Symbolis in the Calvinimsus bestiarum religio attributed to Raynaudus, and printed in the Apopompæus of his works. Vid. infr. foot note p. 379.

[3] Vid. *Use of Force.*

CHAP. XIX. forfeit their future hope. In thinking to be baptised into the name of one who exists not, they will receive nothing; and ranking themselves with a creature, from the creation they will have no help, and believing in one unlike and foreign to the Father in substance, to the Father they will not be united, not possessing His proper Son by nature, who is from Him, who is in the Father, and in whom the Father is, as He Himself has said; but being led astray by them, the wretched men henceforth remain destitute and stripped of the Godhead. For this phantasy of earthly goods will not follow them upon their death; nor when they see the Lord whom they have denied, sitting on His Father's throne, and judging quick and dead, will they be able to call to their help any one of those who have now deceived them; for they shall see them as well as themselves before the judgment-seat, repenting of their deeds of sin and impiety.

CHAPTER XX.

Answer to objections from Scripture; sixthly, Proverbs viii. 22.

161. WE have gone through thus much before the passage in the Proverbs, resisting the falsehoods to which the hearts of these men have given birth, in order that they may know that the Son of God ought not to be called a creature, and may learn rightly to read what admits in truth of a sound explanation.[4] For it is written, *The Lord created Me a beginning of His ways, for His works;*[5] since, however, these are proverbs, and are expressed in the way of proverbs, we must not expound them nakedly in their first sense,

[4] Vid. App. ὀρθός.

[5] Athanasius follows the Sept. in translating the Hebrew קנה by ἔκτισε, *created*, as it is also translated in Gen. xiv. 19, 22. Such too is the sense given in the

but we must inquire into the person spoken of, and thus religiously put its true sense upon it. For what is said in proverbs is not said plainly, but is conveyed latently, as the Lord Himself has taught us in the Gospel according to John, saying, *These things have I spoken unto you in proverbs, but the time cometh when I shall no more speak unto you in proverbs, but openly.* Therefore it is necessary to unfold the sense of what is said, and to seek it as something hidden, and not nakedly to expound as if the meaning were spoken plainly, lest by a false interpretation we wander from the truth. Ed. Ben. ii. § 43—44.

162. If then what is written be about an Angel, or any other of things created, as concerning one of us who are mere works, let *created me* be said. But if it be the Wisdom of God, that speaks concerning Itself, in whom all things which have a being have been framed, what ought we to understand but that *He created* means nothing contrary to "He begat"? Nor, as forgetting that it is Creator and Framer, or ignorant of the difference between the Creator and the creatures, does It number Itself among the creatures; but it signifies a certain sense, as in proverbs, not plainly but latent, which It inspired the sacred writers to use in prophecy, while soon after It doth Itself give the meaning of *He created* in other but parallel expressions, saying, *Wisdom hath made Herself a house.* Now it is plain that our body is Wisdom's house, which It took on Itself to become man; hence the words are parallel to John's, *The Word was made flesh;* and by Solomon Wisdom says of

Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic versions, and by the great majority of primitive writers. On the other hand, Aquila translates ἐκτήσατο, and so read Basil, contr. Eunom. ii. 20, fin. Nyssen contr. Eunom. i. p. 34. Jerome in Isa. xxvi. 13, and the Vulgate translates possedit. קָנָה is translated "gotten," Gen. iv. 1. after the Sept. and Vulg. in the sense of generation, vid. also Deut. xxxii. 6. The Hebrew sense is appealed to by Eusebius, Eccl. Theol. iii. 2, 3. Epiphanius, Hær. lxix. 25, and Jerome in Isa. xxvi. 13. Vid. Petav. Trin. ii. 1. Huet. Origen, ii. 21, 23. C. B. Michael. in loc. Prov.

CHAP. XX. Itself with cautious exactness, not "I am a creature," but only *The Lord hath created Me a beginning of His ways for His works*, yet not "created Me that I might have being," nor again "because I have a creature's beginning and generation."

163. For in this passage, not as signifying the Substance of His Godhead, nor His own everlasting and genuine generation from the Father, has the Word spoken by Solomon, but on the other hand signifying His manhood and economy towards us. And, I repeat, He has not said "I am a creature," or "I became a creature," but only *He created.* For the creatures, having a created substance, are brought into being and are said to be created, and in short the creature is created; but this mere term *He created* does not necessarily signify the substance or the generation, but indicates something else as attaching to Him of whom it speaks, and not simply that He who is said to be created is at once in His Nature and Substance a creature. And this difference divine Scripture recognises, saying concerning the creatures, *The earth is full of Thy creation*, and *the creation itself groaneth together and travaileth together;* and in the Apocalypse he says, *And the third part of the creatures in the sea died which had life;* as also Paul says, *Every creature of God is good, and nothing is to be refused if it be received with thanksgiving;* and in the book of Wisdom it is written, *Having furnished man through Thy wisdom, that he should have dominion over the creatures which Thou hast made.* And these, being creatures, are also said to be created, as we may further hear from our Lord, who says, *He who created them, made them male and female;* and from Moses in his Song, who writes, *Ask now of the days that are past, which were before thee since the day that God created man upon the earth, and from the one side of heaven unto the other.* And Paul, in his Epistle to the Colossians, *Who is the Image of the Invisible God, the*

First-born of every creature, for in Him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are on earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities or powers; all things were created through Him, and for Him, and He is before all. Ed. Ben. ii. § 45—46.

164. That to be called creatures, then, and to be created belongs to things which have by nature a created substance, these passages are sufficient to remind us, though Scripture is full of the like; on the other hand, that the single word *He created* does not simply denote the substance and mode of generation, David shows in the Psalm, *This shall be written for another generation, and the people that is created shall praise the Lord;* and again, *Create in me a clean heart, O God;* and Paul in his Epistle to the Ephesians says, *Having abolished the law of commandments contained in ordinances, for to create in Himself of two one new man;* and again, *Put ye on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.* For neither David spoke of any people being created in substance, nor prayed to have another heart than that he had, but meant renovation according to God and renewal; nor did Paul signify certain two beings created according to substance in the Lord, nor again did He counsel us to put on any other man; but he called the life according to virtue the *man after God*, and by the *created* in Christ he meant the two people who are renewed in Him. Such too is the language in Jeremias: *The Lord hath created a new salvation for a plantation, in which salvation men shall walk to and fro;*[6] and in thus speaking, he does not mean any substance of a creature, but prophesies of the renewal of salvation among men, which has taken place in Christ for us.

165. Such then being the difference between "the crea-

[6] Vid. also Expos. F. § 3, where he notices that this is the version of the Septuagint, Aquila's being "The Lord hath created a new thing in the woman." The authorised version is "a new thing in the earth, a woman shall compass a man," with the Hebrew, as is

CHAP. XX

tures" and the mere word *He created*, if you find anywhere in divine Scripture the Lord called "creature," produce it and make the most of it; but if it is nowhere written that He is a creature, only He Himself says about Himself in the Proverbs, *The Lord hath created Me*, shame upon you both on the ground of the broad distinction aforesaid, and again for that the diction is manifestly that of proverbs; and accordingly let *He created* be understood, not of His being a creature, but of that human nature which is attached to Him, for to this belongs creation. Indeed, is it not evidently unfair in you, when David and Paul say *He created*, then indeed to understand not the substance and the generation, but the renewal; yet, when the Lord says *He created*, to number His substance among the creatures? and again, when Scripture says, *Wisdom hath built her an house, she hath hewn out her seven pillars*, to understand *house* allegorically, but yet to take *He created* as it stands, and to fasten on it the idea of creature? and neither His being Framer of all has had any weight with you, nor have you feared His being the sole and proper Offspring of the Father, but recklessly, as if you had enlisted against Him, do ye fight, and think less of Him than of men.[7]

166. For the very passage proves that it is only an invention of your own to call the Lord a creature. For the Lord, knowing His own Substance to be the Only-begotten Wisdom and Offspring of the Father, and other than things made who are by nature creatures, says in love to man, *The Lord hath created Me a beginning of His ways*, as if to say, "My Father hath prepared for Me a body, and has created Me for men in behalf of their salvation." For, as when John says, *The Word was made flesh*, we do not

the Vulgate. Athan. has preserved Aquila's version in three other places. in Psalm xxx. 12, lix. 5, lxv. 18.

[7] Thus with us the Queen is said to "create" peers; and at Rome Cardinals of the Pope's making are called his "creaturæ." "Creatores," says Ducange, are those "qui ad publica munera alios nominant."

conceive the whole Word Himself to be flesh, but to have put on flesh and become man, and on hearing, *Christ hath become a curse for us*, and *He hath made Him sin for us who knew no sin*, we do not simply conceive this, that whole Christ has become curse and sin, but that He has taken on Him the curse which lay against us, (as the Apostle has said, *Has redeemed us from the curse*, and *has carried*, as Esaias has said, *our sins*, and as Peter has written, *has borne them in the body on the wood*;) so, if it is said in the Proverbs *He created*, we must not conceive that the whole Word is in nature a creature, but that He put on the created body and that God created Him for our sakes, *preparing* for Him the created *body*, as it is written, for our sakes, that in Him we might be capable of being renewed and made gods. Ed. Ben. ii. § 46—47.

167. What then has deceived you, O senseless, to call the Creator a creature? or whence did you purchase for you this new thought, to make a brag of? For the Proverbs say *He created*, but they call not the Son creature, but Offspring; and, according to the distinction in Scripture aforesaid of *He created* and "creature," they acknowledge, what is by nature proper to the Son, that He is the Only-begotten Wisdom and Framer of the creatures; and when they say *He created*, they say it not in respect of His Substance, but signify that He was becoming a beginning of many ways; so that *He created* is in contrast with *Offspring*, and His being the *Beginning of ways* [8] in contrast with His being the Only-begotten Word. For if He is Offspring, how call ye Him creature? for no one says that he begets what he creates, nor calls his proper offspring creatures; and again, if He is Only-begotten, how becomes He *beginning of the ways?* for of necessity, if He was created a

[8] ἀρχὴν ὁδων, and so in Justin's Tryph. 61. The Bened. Ed. in loc. refers to a similar application of the word to our Lord in Tatian contr. Gent. 5, Athenag. Ap. 10, Iren. Hær. iv. 20. n. 3, Origen in Joan. tom. i. 39, Tertull. adv. Prax. 6, and Ambros. de Fid. iii. 7.

CHAP. XX. beginning of all things, He is no longer alone, as having those who were made after Him.

168. For Reuben, when he became a beginning of children, was not only-begotten, but though in time indeed first, still in nature and relationship one among those who came after him. Therefore, if the Word also is *a beginning of the ways*, He must be such as the ways are, and the ways must be such as the Word, though in point of time He be created first of them. For the beginning too of a body politic is such as are the other constituent parts of the body, and the other parts too being joined to it, make the polity whole and one, as the many members of one body; nor does one part of it make, and another come to be made and is subject to the former, but the whole state equally has its government and constitution from its maker. If then the Lord is in such sense created as a *beginning* of all things, it would follow that He and all other things together make up the unity of the creation, and He neither differs from others, though He became the *beginning* of all, nor is He Lord of them, though older in point of time, for He has one and the same constitution and ruler as the rest.

169. If then the Word be a mere creature, as you hold, how can He be created sole and first at all, so as to be beginning of all? when it is plain from what has been said that among the creatures nothing is of a constant nature and of prior formation, but each has its generation with all the rest, however it may excel others in glory. For as to the separate stars or the great lights, not this appeared first and that second, but in one day and by the same command, they were all called into being. And such was the generation of the quadrupeds, and of birds, and fishes, and cattle, and plants; such too was that of the human race after God's Image; for though Adam only was formed out of the earth, yet in him were the conditions of the

succession of the whole race. And from the visible creation of the world, we clearly discern that His invisible things also, *being understood by the things that are made*, do not stand each by itself; for it was not first one and then another, but all at once were constituted after their kind. For the Apostle did not number individually, and say "whether Angel, or Throne, or Dominion, or Authority," but he mentions together all according to their rank, *whether Angels, or Archangels, or Principalities:* for in this way is the generation of the creatures. If then, as I have said, the Word were creature, He must have been brought into being, not first of them, but together with all the other Powers, though in glory He excel the rest ever so much. For so we find it to be in their case, that at once they came to be, with neither first nor second, and they differ from each other in glory, some on the right of the throne, some all round, and some on the left, but one and all praising and standing in service before the Lord. Ed. Ben. ii. § 48—49.

170. Therefore, if the Word is a creature, He would not be what I hold Him to be, the First and the Son; this, however, He can be, because, though He is the First, it is not in point of substance that He is first; otherwise, then, certainly, as being the Beginning of all, He is simply in the number of all. But if He is not such a beginning, then neither is He a creature; and indeed it is very plain that the Word of God could not have been a beginning at all towards us, unless He had been more than a beginning in Himself.[9] As I have said of Him, He differs in substance

[9] He says that no one is really "a beginning" of creatures who is not a creature; yet such a title can and does belong to the Word. It is the name of an *office* which the Eternal Word alone can fill. His Divine Sonship is both superior and necessary to the office of a "Beginning." It includes a start as well as a commencement. Hence it is both true (as he says) that "if the Word is a creature, He is not a beginning;" and yet that that "beginning," which by a condescension He began, is "in the number of the creatures." Though He becomes the "beginning," He is not "a beginning as to His *substance*."

CHAP. XX. and nature from the creatures, and is other than they; whereas of the only and True God, He is the Likeness and Image, and the only one such. Hence He is not classed with creatures in Scripture, but David rebukes those who dare even to think of Him as such, saying, *Who among the gods is like unto the Lord?* and *Who is like unto the Lord among the sons of God?* and Baruch, *This is our God, and another shall not be reckoned with Him.* For the One creates, and the rest are created; and the One is the proper Word and Wisdom of the Father's Substance, and through this Word things which came to be, which before existed not, were made. Your famous assertion then, that the Son is a creature, is not true, but is your phantasy only; nay, Solomon convicts you of having these many times misinterpreted him. For he has not called Him creature, but God's Offspring and Wisdom, saying *God in Wisdom hath established the earth*, and *Wisdom hath built her an house.*

171. And the very passage in question proves your impiety: for it is written, *The Lord created Me for the works:* where, observe, He does not say, "in order that I might make the works," but speaks of them as already made. It follows, unless His "creation" is an event later than His original existence, that the works are older than He is, and He found them in existence on His coming into being, and that He was also brought into being for their sake. And if so, how is He before all things notwithstanding? and how were all things made through Him and consist in Him? for behold, you say that the works consisted before Him, for which He is created and sent. But it is not so; perish the thought! false is the supposition of the heretics. For the Word of God is not creature, but Creator; and says in the manner of proverbs, *He created Me* only when He put on created flesh.

172. And something besides may be understood from the passage itself; for, though He be Son and have God for His

Father, (for He is His proper Offspring,) yet here He names the Father Lord; not that He was servant, but because He took a servant's form. For it became Him, on the one hand being the Word from the Father, to call God Father; for this is proper to son towards father; on the other, having come to finish the work, and taken a servant's form, it became Him to name the Father Lord. And this difference He Himself has taught by an apt distinction, saying in the Gospels, *I thank Thee, O Father*, and then, *Lord of heaven and earth.* For He calls God His Father, but of the creatures He names Him Lord; as showing clearly from these words, that, when He put on the creature, then it was He called the Father Lord. And in the prayer of David the Holy Spirit marks the same distinction, saying in the Psalms, *Give Thy strength unto Thy Child, and help the Son of Thine handmaid*, and, though the word *child* sometimes means "servant" as well, it must be recollected that Isaac is in one place called Abraham's *child*, and the son of the Shunamite *young child. Child* then and *Son of Thy handmaid* are placed in contrast; the natural and true child of God with created nature. The one, as Son, has the Father's might, but the rest are in need of salvation. Reasonably then, we being servants, when He became as we, He too calls the Father Lord, as we do; and this He did from love to man, that we too, being servants by nature, and receiving the Spirit of the Son, might have confidence to call Him by grace Father, who is by nature our Lord. But as we, in calling the Lord Father, do not deny that servitude which is by nature, (for we are His works, and it is *He that hath made us, and not we ourselves*,) so when the Son, on taking the servant's form, says, *The Lord hath created Me a beginning of His ways*, let them not deny the eternity of His Godhead, and that *in the beginning was the Word*, and *all things were made by Him*, and *in Him all things were created.*

ED. BEN. ii. § 50—51.

Chapter XXI.

Answer to objections from Scripture; sixthly, Proverbs viii. 22.

Chap. XXI. 173. For the passage in the Proverbs, as I have said before, signifies, not the Substance, but the manhood of the Word; for if He says that He was created *for the works*, He thereby shows His intention of signifying, not His Substance, but the Economy which took place *for His works*, which comes second into existence. For things which are in formation and creation are made specially that they may be and may exist, and next they have to do whatever the Word bids them, as may be seen in the case of things generally. For Adam was made, not that he might work, but that first he might be man; for it was after this that he received the command to work. And Noe came into being, not because of the ark, but that first he might exist and become a man; for after this he received commandment to prepare the ark. And the like will be found in every case on inquiring into it;—thus the great Moses first was born a man, and next was entrusted with the government of the people. Therefore here too we must suppose the like; for thou seest, that the Word is not created in order to be, but *In the beginning was the Word*, and He is afterwards created *for the works* and the economy towards them. For before the works were made, the Son was ever, nor was there yet need that He should be created; but when the works were created and need arose afterwards of the Economy for their restoration, then it was that the Word took upon Himself this condescension and assimilation to the works; which He has shown us by the word *He created*. And through the Prophet Esaias, willing to signify the like, He says again: *And now thus saith the Lord, who formed Me from the womb*

to be His servant, to gather together Jacob unto Him and Israel, I shall be brought together and be glorified before the Lord. Ed. Ben. i. § 51.

174. See here too, He is formed not that He may have being, but in order to gather together the tribes, which were in existence before He was formed. For as in the former passage stands *He created*, so in this *He formed;* and as there *for the works*, so here *to gather together;* so that in every point of view it appears that *He created* and *He formed* are said after *the Word was*, and in order not to His having existence, but to His undertaking an office. For, as before that *forming* the tribes existed, for whose sake He was formed, so does it appear that the works existed, for which He was created. And when *in the beginning was the Word*, not yet were the works, as I have said before; but when the works were made and the need required, then *He created* was said; and as if some son, when servants were lost and in the hands of the enemy by their own carelessness, and need was urgent, were sent by his father to succour and recover them, and on setting out were to put over him the like dress with them, and should fashion himself as they, lest the capturers, recognising[10] him as the master, should take to flight and prevent his descending to those who were hidden under the earth by them; and then were any one to inquire of him why he did so, were to make answer, "My father thus formed and prepared me for his works," while in thus speaking, he neither implies that he is a servant nor one of the works, nor speaks of the beginning of his generation, but of the subsequent charge given him over the works,—in the

[10] Vid. the well-known passage in S. Ignatius, ad Eph. 19, where the Evil Spirit is said to have been ignorant of the Virginity of Mary, and of the Nativity and the Death of Christ; Orig. Hom. 6, in Luc. Basil (if Basil) Hom. in t. 2, App. p. 598, ed. Ben. and Jerome in Matt. i. 18, who quote it. Vid. also Leon. Serm. 22, 3. August. Trin. ix. 21. Clement, Eclog. Proph. p. 1002, ed. Potter.

CHAP. XXI. same way the Lord also, having put over Him our flesh, and *being found in fashion as a man*, if He were questioned by those who saw Him thus and marvelled, would say, *The Lord created Me the beginning of His ways for His works*, and *He formed Me to gather together Israel.*

175. This again the Spirit foretells in the Psalms, saying, *Thou didst set Him over the Works of Thine hands;* which elsewhere the Lord signified of Himself, *I am set as King by Him upon His holy hill of Sion.* And as, when He shone in the body upon Sion, He had not His beginning of existence or of reign, but being God's Word and everlasting King, He vouchsafed that His kingdom should shine in a human way in Sion, that redeeming them and us from the sin which reigned in them, He might bring them under His Father's Kingdom, so, on being set *for the works*, He is not set for things which did not yet exist, but for such as already were and needed restoration. *He created*, then, and *He formed* and *He set*, have the same meaning, not denoting the beginning of His existence, nor His substance as created, but that beneficent renovation which He brought about for us. Accordingly, though He thus speaks, yet He also taught us that He Himself existed before this, when He said, *Before Abraham was made, I am;* and *When He prepared the heavens, I was present with Him;* and *I was with Him disposing all things.* And as He Himself was before Abraham was made, and Israel was made after Abraham, and plainly He exists first and is formed afterwards, and His forming signifies, not His beginning of being, but His taking manhood, wherein also He collects together the tribes of Israel; so, as *being always with the Father*, He Himself is Framer of the creation, and His works are evidently later than Himself, and *He created* signifies not His beginning of being, but the economy which took place for the works, which He fulfilled in the flesh. For it became Him, as being

other than the works, nay rather their Framer, to take upon Himself their renovation, that, whereas He is created for us, all things may be now created in Him. For when He said *He created*, He forthwith added the reason, naming *the works*, that His creation for the works might signify His becoming man for their renovation.

176. And this is usual with divine Scripture;[1] for when it signifies the fleshly generation of the Son, it adds also the cause for which He became man; but when He speaks or His servants announce anything of His Godhead, all is said in simple diction, and with an absolute sense, and without reason being involved. For He is the Father's Radiance; and as the Father exists, but not for any reason, neither must we seek the reason of the existence of that Radiance. Thus it is written, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God;* and the wherefore it assigns not; but when *the Word was made flesh*, then it adds the reason why, saying, *And dwelt among us.* And again the Apostle says, *Who being in the form of God*, but he has introduced no reason, till, *He took on Him the form of a servant;* for then he continues, *He humbled Himself unto death, even the death of the cross;* for it was for this that He both became flesh and took the form of a servant. And the Lord Himself has spoken many things in proverbs; but when giving us notices about Himself, He has spoken absolutely: *I in the Father and the Father in Me*, and *I and the Father are one*, and *He that hath seen Me, hath seen the Father*, and *I am the Light of the world*, and *I am the Truth;* not setting down in each case the reason, nor the wherefore, lest He Himself should seem second to those things for which He was made. Else, that reason, without which He had not been brought into

[1] ἔθος ἐστὶ τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ· and infr. n. 251, p. 380. And τῆς γραφῆς ἔθος ἐχούσης, and Orat. iv. § 27, 33; and elsewhere.

CHAP. XXI. being, would needs take precedence of Him. Paul, for instance, *separated as an Apostle for the Gospel, which the Lord had promised afore by the Prophets*, was thereby made subordinate to the Gospel, of which he was made minister, and John, being chosen to prepare the Lord's way, was made subordinate to the Lord; but the Lord, not being made subordinate to any reason why He should be Word, save only that He is the Father's Offspring and Only-begotten Wisdom, when He becomes man, then assigns the reason, wherefore He is about to bear flesh.

177. For the need of man precedes His becoming man, apart from which He had not put on flesh. And what the need was for which He became man, the Lord Himself thus signifies, *I came down from heaven not to do Mine own will, but the will of Him that sent Me. And this is the will of Him which hath sent Me, that of all which He hath given Me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. And this is the will of My Father, that every one which seeth the Son and believeth on Him may have everlasting life, and I will raise Him up at the last day.* And again: *I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on Me should not abide in darkness.* And again He says: *To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that* I *should bear witness unto the truth.* And John has written: *For this was manifested the Son of God, that He might destroy the works of the devil.* To give a witness then, and for our sakes to undergo death, to raise man up and undo the works of the devil, the Saviour came, and this is the reason of His incarnate presence. For otherwise a resurrection had not been, unless there had been death; and how had death been, unless He had had a mortal body?

178. This the Apostle, learning from Him, thus sets forth: *Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same; that*

through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil, and deliver them who through fear of death were all their life-time subject to bondage. And, *Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead.* And again, *For what the Law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit.* And John says, *For God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved.* And again, the Saviour has spoken in His own person, *For judgment am I come into this world, that they who see not might see, and that they which see might be made blind.* Not for Himself then, but for our salvation, and to abolish death, and to condemn sin, and to give sight to the blind, and to raise up all from the dead, therefore has He come; but if not for Himself He has come, but for us, by consequence not for Himself but for us is He created. But if not for Himself is He created, but for us, then is He not Himself a creature, but, as having put on our flesh, He uses such language. ED. BEN. II. § 54—55.

179. And that this is the sense of the Scriptures we may learn from the Apostle, who says in his Epistle to the Ephesians, *Having broken down the middle wall of partition between us, having abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances, to create in Himself of twain one new man, so making peace.* But if in Him the twain are created, and these are in His body, reasonably then, bearing the twain in Himself, He is as if Himself created; for those who were created in Himself hath He made one, and He was in them, as if they. And thus, the two being created in Him, He may say suitably, *The Lord hath created Me.* For as by receiving our infirmities, He is said to be infirm Himself, though not Him-

CHAP. XXI. self infirm (for He is the power of God, and as ——— He became sin for us and a curse, though not having sinned Himself, but because He Himself bare our sins and our curse), so, by creating us in Himself let Him say, *He created Me for the works*, though not Himself a creature.

180. For if, as they hold, the Substance of the Word being of created nature, therefore it is that He says, *The Lord created Me*, as being a creature, He was not created for us; but if He was not created for us, we are not created in Him; and, if not created in Him, we have Him not in ourselves but externally; as, for instance, as receiving instruction from Him as from a teacher. And, it being so with us, sin has not lost its reign over the flesh, being inherent and not cast out of it. But the Apostle opposes such a doctrine a little before when he says, *For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus;* and if in Christ we are created, then it is not He of whom creation is predicated, but of us in Him; and the words *He created* are for our sake. For because of our need, the Word, though being Creator, bore to receive appellations which are used of things under creation; which are not proper to Him, as being the Word, but are ours who are created in Him. And as, since the Father is always, so is His Word, and as being always, says, *I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him*, and *I am in the Father and the Father in Me;* so, when for our need He became man, consistently does He use our language, as ourselves, *The Lord hath created Me*, that by His dwelling in the flesh, sin might perfectly be expelled from the flesh, and we might have our mind free. For what ought He, when made man, to say? "In the beginning I was man?" this were neither suitable to Him nor true; and as it beseemed not to say this, so it is natural and proper in the case of man to say, *He created* and *He made* Him.

181. On this account then the reason is added of *He created*, namely, the need of the works; and where the reason is

added, that reason happily explains the passage. Thus here, when He says *He created*, He sets down the reason, *the works;* on the other hand, when He signifies absolutely His generation from the Father, straightway He adds, *Before all the hills He begets Me;* but He does not add the "wherefore," as in the case of *He created*, when He says, *for the works*, but He says absolutely, *He begets Me*, as in the passage, *In the beginning was the Word.* For, though no works had been created, still *the Word* of God *was*, and *the Word was God.* And His becoming man would not have taken place, had not the need of men become a cause. The Son then is not a creature. Ed. Ben. ii. § 56—57.

Chapter XXII.

Answer to objections from Scripture; sixthly, Proverbs viii. 22.

182. For had He been a creature, He had not said, *He begets Me*, for the creatures are from without, and are works of the Maker; but the Offspring is not from without as a work, but from the Father, and belongs to His Substance. Wherefore they are creatures, but He God's Word and Only-begotten Son. Certainly, Moses did not say of the creation, "In the beginning He begat;" nor "*In the beginning*" was, but *In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.* Nor did David say in the Psalm, *Thy hands have* "begotten me," but *made me and fashioned me*, everywhere applying the word *made* to the creatures, but to the Son contrariwise; for He has not said "I made," but *I begat*, and *He begets Me*, and *My heart has burst with a good Word.* And in the instance of the creation, *In the beginning He made;* but in the instance of the Son, *In the beginning was the Word.*

183. And there is this difference, that the creatures are

CH. XXII. made upon and after the beginning, and have a beginning of existence connected with an interval; wherefore also what is said of them, *In the beginning He made*, is as much as saying of them, "From the beginning He made:"—as the Lord, knowing what He had made, has taught, when He shamed the Pharisees, with the words, *He who made them from the beginning, made them male and female;* for from some beginning, when they were not yet, were the works brought into being and created. This too the Holy Spirit has signified in the Psalms, saying, *Thou, Lord, at the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth;* and again, *O think upon Thy congregation which Thou hast purchased from the beginning;* now it is plain that what takes place at the beginning has a beginning of creation, and that from some beginning God purchased His congregation. And that *In the beginning He made*, from His saying *made*, means "began to make," Moses himself shows by saying, after the completion of all things, *And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it He had rested from all His work which God began to make.* Therefore the creatures began to be made; but the Word of God, not having that from which a beginning comes, did not begin to be, nor begin to come to be, but was ever. And the works have their beginning in their making, and their beginning precedes their coming to be; but the Word, not being of things which come to be, rather comes to be Himself the Framer of those which have a beginning. And the being of things made is measured by their becoming, and from some beginning doth God begin to make them through the Word, that it may be known that they were not before their generation; but the Word has His being in no other beginning—that is, origin—than the Father, whom they allow to be unoriginate, so that He too exists unoriginately in the Father, being His Offspring, and not His creature. Thus does divine Scripture recognise the difference between the

Offspring and things made, and show that the Offspring is a Son, not begun from any beginning, but eternal; but that the thing made, as an external work of the Maker, began to come into being. John therefore, delivering divine doctrine about the Son, and knowing the difference of the phrases, said not, "In the beginning became" or "was made," but *In the beginning was the Word;* that we might understand "Offspring" by *was*, and not account of Him by intervals, but believe the Son always and eternally to exist. Ed. Ben. ii. § 57—58.

184. And with these proofs, why, O Arians, misunderstand the passage in Deuteronomy, and thus venture a fresh act of impiety against the Lord, saying that "He is a work," or "creature," or indeed "offspring"? for offspring and work you take to mean the same thing; but here too you shall be shown to be as unlearned as you are impious. Your first passage is this, *Is not He thy Father that hath bought thee? hath He not made thee and created thee?* And shortly after in the same Song he says, *Of the God that begat thee thou art unmindful, and hast forgotten God that nourished thee.* Now the meaning conveyed in these passages is very remarkable; for he says not first *He begat*, lest that term should be taken as indiscriminate with *He made*, and these men should have a pretence for saying, "Moses tells us indeed that God said from the beginning, *Let us make man*, but he soon after says himself, *Of the God that begat thee thou art unmindful*, as if the terms were indifferent; for offspring and work are the same." Not so, for after the words *bought* and *made*, he has added last of all *begat*, that the sentence might carry its own interpretation; for in the word *made* he accurately denotes what belongs to men by nature, namely, to be works and things made; but in the word *begat* he shows God's loving-kindness exercised towards men after He had created them. And since they were ungrateful upon this, thereupon Moses reproaches them, saying

CH. XXII. first, *Do ye thus requite the Lord?* and then adds, ——— *Is not He thy Father that hath bought thee? Hath He not made thee and created thee?* And next he says, *They sacrificed unto devils, not to God, to gods whom they knew not, to new gods whom your fathers knew not; of the God that begat thee thou art unmindful.* For God not only created them to be men, but called them to be sons, as having begotten them. For the term *begat* is here as elsewhere expressive of a son, as He says by the Prophet, *I have begotten sons and exalted them;* and generally, when Scripture wishes to signify a son, it does so, not by the term *created*, but undoubtedly by the term *begat.*

185. And this John seems to say, *He gave to them power to become children of God, even to them that believe on His Name; which were begotten not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.* And here too a cautious distinction is appositely observed, for first he says *become*, because they are not called sons by nature but by adoption; then he says *were begotten*, because like the Jews they had altogether received the name of son, though the chosen people, as says the Prophet, *rebelled against* their Benefactor. And this is God's kindness to man, that of whom He is Maker, of them according to grace He afterwards becomes Father also; that is, becomes such when men, His creatures, receive into their hearts, as the Apostle says, *the Spirit of His Son, crying, Abba, Father.* And these are they who, having received the Word, gained power from Him to become sons of God; for they could not become sons, being by nature creatures, otherwise than by receiving the Spirit of the natural and true Son. Wherefore, that this might be, *The Word became flesh*, that He might make man capable of godhead.

186. This same meaning may be gained also from the Prophet Malachi, who says, *Hath not One God created us? Have we not all one Father?* for first he puts *created*, next

Father, to show, as the other writers, that from the beginning we were creatures by nature, and God is our Creator through the Word; but afterwards we were made sons, and thenceforward God the Creator becomes our Father also. Therefore, the word Father has a relation towards a Son, and a Son, and not a creature, is related towards a Father. This passage also proves, that we are not sons by nature, but it is the Son who is in us; and again, that God is not our Father by nature, but of that Word in us, in whom and because of whom we *cry*, *Abba*, *Father*. And so in like manner, the Father calls them sons in whomsoever He sees His own Son, and says, *I begat;* since begetting is significant of a Son, and making is indicative of the works. And thus it is that we are not begotten first, but made; for it is written, *Let Us make man;* but afterwards on receiving the grace of the Spirit, we are said thenceforth to be begotten also; just as the great Moses in his Song with an apposite meaning says first *He bought*, and afterwards *He begat;* lest, hearing *He begat*, they might forget that nature of theirs which was from the beginning; but that they might know that from the beginning they are creatures, but when according to grace they are said to be begotten, as sons, still no less than before are men works according to nature. ED. BEN. ii. § 58—60.

187. And that creature and offspring are not the same, but differ from each other in nature and the signification of the words, the Lord Himself shows even in the Proverbs, for having said, *The Lord hath created Me a beginning of His ways;* He has added, *But before all the hills He begat Me.* If then the Word were by nature and in His Substance a creature, and there were no difference between offspring and creature, He would not have added, *He begat Me*, but had been satisfied with *He created*, as if that term implied *He begat;* but, as the case stands, after saying, *He created Me a beginning of His ways for His works*, He has

CH. XXII. added, not simply *begat Me*, but has connected it with the conjunction *But*, as guarding thereby the term *created*, when He says, *But before all the hills He begat Me*. For *begat Me* succeeding in such close connection to *created Me*, makes the meaning one, and shows that *created* is said with an object; not so *begat Me*, which is therefore prior to *created Me*. For as, if He had said the reverse, "The Lord begat Me," and went on, "But before the hills He created Me," *created* had certainly preceded *begat;* so having said first *created*, and then added *But before all the hills He begat Me*, He necessarily shows that *begat* preceded *created*. For in saying, *Before all He begat Me*, He intimates that He is other than all things; it having been shown to be true in an earlier place in this book, that no one creature was made before another, but all things that were made subsisted at once together upon one and the same command. Therefore neither do the words which follow *created* also follow *begat Me;* but in the case of *created* is added *beginning of ways*, but of *begat Me*, He says not, "He begat me as a beginning," but *before all He begat Me*. But He who is before all is not a beginning of all, but is other than all; but if other than all, (in which "all" the beginning of all is included,) it follows that He is other than the creatures; and it becomes a clear point, that the Word, being other than all things and before all, afterwards is created *a beginning of the ways for works*, because He became man, that, as the Apostle has said, He who is the *Beginning* and *First-born from the dead, in all things might have the pre-eminence.*

188. Such then being the difference between *created* and *begat Me*, and between *beginning of ways* and *before all*, God, being Creator first, next, as has been said, becomes Father of men, because of His Word dwelling in them. But in the case of the Word the reverse; for God, being His Father by nature, becomes afterwards both

His Creator and Maker, when the Word puts on that flesh which was created and made, and becomes man. For, as men, receiving the Spirit of the Son, become children through Him, so the Word of God, when He Himself puts on the flesh of man, then is said both to be created and to have been made. If then we are by nature sons, then is He by nature creature and work; but if we become sons by adoption and grace, then has the Word also, when in grace towards us He became man, said, *The Lord hath created Me.* Ed. Ben. ii. § 60—62.

189. And now I come to that further truth which is implied in His being "beginning of ways." When He put on a created nature and became like us in body, reasonably was He therefore called both our Brother and *First-born*. For though it was after us that He was made man for us, and our brother by similitude of body, still He is therefore called and is the *First-born* of us, because, all men being lost according to the transgression of Adam, His flesh before all others was saved and liberated, as being the Word's Body; and henceforth we, becoming incorporate with It, are saved after Its pattern. For in It the Lord becomes our guide to the Kingdom of Heaven and to His own Father, saying, *I am the Way* and *the Door*, and "through Me all must enter." Whence also is He said to be *First-born from the dead*, not that He died before us, for we had died first; but because having undergone death for us and abolished it, He was the first to rise, as man, for our sakes raising His own Body. Henceforth He having risen, we too, from Him, and because of Him, rise in due course from the dead.

190. But if He is also called *First-born of the creation*, still this is not as if He were levelled to the creatures, and only first of them in point of time, (for how should that be since He is *Only-begotten?*) but it is because of the Word's condescension to the creatures, according to which

CH. XXII. He hath become the *Brother* of *many*. For the term *Only-begotten* is used where there are no brethren, but *First-born* is used because of brethren. Accordingly it is nowhere written of Him in the Scriptures, "the first-born of God," any more than "the creature of God;" but it is by *Only-begotten* and *Son* and *Word* and *Wisdom*, that He is related and belongs to the Father. Thus, *We have seen His glory, the glory as of the Only-begotten of the Father;* and *God sent His Only-begotten Son;* and *O Lord, Thy Word endureth for ever;* and *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God;* and *Christ the Power of God and the Wisdom of God;* and *This is My beloved Son;* and *Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God.* But *First-born*, if used of Him, implied the descent to the creation; for of it has He been called first-born; and *He created* Me implies the Son's grace towards the works, for for them is He created. If then He is Only-begotten, as indeed He is, *First-born* needs some explanation; but if He be literally First-born, then He is not Only-begotten. For the same cannot be both Only-begotten and First-born, except in different relations;—that is, Only-begotten, because of His generation from the Father, as has been said; and First-born, because of His condescension to the creation and the brotherhood which He has made with many. Certainly, those two terms being inconsistent with each other, one should say that the attribute of being Only-begotten has justly the preference in the instance of the Word, in that there is no other Word, or other Wisdom, but He alone is very Son of the Father.

191. Moreover, as was before said, not under circumstances which account for it, but absolutely, it is said of Him, *the Only-begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father;* but the word *First-born* has the creation as a circumstance to account for it, for Paul proceeds to say, *For in Him all things were created.* But if all the creatures

were created in Him, He is other than the creatures, and is not a creature, but the Creator of the creatures. Not then because He was from the Father was He called *First-born*, but because in Him the creation came into being; and as before the creation He was the Son, through whom was the creation, so also before He was called the First-born of the whole creation not the less was the Word Himself with God and the Word was God.

192. Yet they go about saying, "If He is First-born of all creation, it is plain that He too is one of the creation." Men without understanding! if He is simply *First-born of the whole creation*, as we say, then He is, by the contrast involved in the word "whole," other than the whole creation; for He says not "He is First-born by comparison as being above the rest of the creatures, and thereby among them and one of them," but it is written, *of the whole creation*, in order that He may appear other than the creation itself.[2] Reuben, for instance, is not said to be first-born of all the children of Jacob, which would imply his being external to them, but of Jacob himself and his brethren; lest he should be thought to be some other beside the children of Jacob. If then the Word also were one of the creatures, Scripture would have said that He was First-born of other

[2] Here the Greek idiom must be kept in view, which differs from the English. As the English comparative, so the Greek superlative implies or admits the exclusion of the subject of which it is used, from the things with which it is contrasted. Thus "Solomon is wiser than the heathen," implies of course that he was not a heathen: but the Greeks can say, "Solomon is wisest of the heathen," or according to Milton's imitation, "the fairest of her daughters Eve." Vid. as regards the very word πρῶτος, John i. 15; and supr. p. 288, [ii. § 30, ed. Ben.] also πλείστην ἢ ἔμπροσθεν ἐξουσίαν 3 Machab. vii. 21. As in the comparative, to obviate this exclusion, we put in the word *other* (ante *alios* immanior omnes), so too in the Greek superlative, "Socrates is wisest of all the heathen." Athanasius then says in this passage, that "first-born of creatures" implies that our Lord was not a creature, whereas it is not said of Him "first-born of brethren," lest He should be excluded from men, but "first-born *among* brethren," where *among* is equivalent to *other*.

CH. XXII. creatures; as speaking of His manhood, the Apostle says *among many brethren*. But now the sacred writers saying that He is *First-born of the whole creation*, the Son of God is plainly shown to be other than the whole creation and not a creature. For if He is a creature, He will be First-born of Himself. How then is it possible for Him to be before and after Himself? next, if He is a creature, and the whole creation through Him came into existence, and in Him consists, how can He both create the creation and be one of the things which are in Him created?

193. Such a notion being simply extravagant, it is certain that He is *First-born among many brethren* in His relation to the flesh, and *First-born from the dead*, because the resurrection of the dead is from Him and after Him; and *First-born of the whole creation*, because of the Father's love to man, which brought it to pass that in His Word not only *all things consist*, but that the creation itself, of which the Apostle speaks, *waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God, shall be delivered* one time *from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.* Of this creation thus set free, the Lord will be First-born, both of it and of all those who become its children, that by His being named first, those that come after Him may abide, as all depending on the Word as a beginning.

194. And I think that these men themselves will be shamed by this consideration: if the case stands not as we have said, but as they would rule it, viz., that He is *First-born of the whole creation* as being in His substance a creature among creatures, let them reflect that they will be conceiving of Him as brother and fellow of the things without reason and life. For of the whole creation these also are parts; and the *First-born*, in the sense they wish to take the word, must be first indeed in point of time, but only in this respect, being in kind and similitude the same with all. How then can they say this without exceeding all measures

of impiety? For it is evident to all, that neither for Himself, as if a creature, nor as having any connection according to substance with the whole creation, has He been called *First-born* of it; but because the Word, when at the beginning He framed the creatures, condescended to things which were to have a beginning, or to be made, that it might be possible for them to come into being.[3] For they could not have endured His absolute nature and His splendour from the Father, unless, condescending by the Father's love for man, He had supported them and taken hold of them and brought them into substance; and next, because, by this condescension of the Word, the creation too is made a son through Him, that He might be in all respects *First-born* of it, as has been said, both in creating the world, and also in being brought into it for the sake of all therein. For so it is written, *When He bringeth the First-born into the world, He saith, Let all the Angels of God worship Him.* Let Christ's enemies hear and tear themselves in pieces because it is His coming into the world which gives Him the name of *First-born* of all; and thus the Son is the Father's *Only-begotten*, because He alone is from the Father, and He is the *First-born of creation*, because of this adoption in Him of all creatures as sons.[4]

195. And as He is First-born among brethren and rose from the dead, *the first fruits of them that slept;* so, since it became Him *in all things to be first*, therefore He is created *a Beginning of ways*, that we, setting out thereon and entering through Him who says, *I am the Way* and

[3] He does not here say with Asterius that God could not create man immediately, for the Word is God, but that He did not create him without at the same time infusing a grace or presence from Himself into his creature so as to enable it to endure His external plastic hand; in other words, that it was created *in Him*, not as something external to Him (in spite of the distinction between διὰ and ἐν, in *Illud super omnia*).

[4] Only-begotten, when predicated of the Son, is a word of *nature*, and First-born a term of *office*. Hence the former was His from eternity, the latter only from creation.

CH. XXII. *the Door*, and partaking of the knowledge of the Father, may also hear the words, *Blessed are the undefiled in the Way*, and *Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.* And He is *Beginning of ways*, because when the first way, which was through Adam, was lost, and in place of paradise we deviated into death, and heard the word, *Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return*, therefore the Word of God, who loves man, puts on Him created flesh at the Father's will, that whereas the first man had made it dead through the transgression, He Himself might quicken it in the blood of His proper Body, and might open *for us a way new and living*, as the Apostle says, *through the veil, that is to say, His flesh.* This he signifies elsewhere thus, *Wherefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creation; old things are passed away, behold, all things are become new.* But if a new creation has taken place, some one must be first of this creation; mere man then, made of earth only, such as we are become from the transgression, could not be he. For in the first creation men had become unfaithful, and through them that first creation had been lost; and there was need of some one else to renew the first, and to preserve what was renewed.

196. Therefore from love to man none other than the Lord, the *beginning* of the new creation, is created as *the Way*, and consistently says, *The Lord created Me a beginning of ways for His works;* that man might no longer pass his lifetime according to that first creation, but, there being a beginning of a new creation, and in it the Christ *a beginning of ways*, we might follow Him henceforth, while He says to us, *I am the Way:* as the blessed Apostle teaches in his Epistle to the Colossians, saying, *He is the Head of the body, the Church, who is the Beginning, the First-born rom the dead, that in all things He might have the pre-eminence.* For if, as has been said, because of the resur-

rection from the dead, He is called a beginning, and then a resurrection took place when He, bearing our flesh, had given Himself to death for us, it is evident that His words, *He created Me a beginning of ways*, is indicative not of His substance, but of His bodily presence. For, as death belonged to the body, so in like manner to the bodily presence are the words proper, *The Lord created Me a beginning of His ways.* For since the Saviour was thus created according to the flesh, and had become a beginning of things to be new created, and possessed the first fruits of our race, viz., that human flesh which He took to Himself, therefore after Him, as is fit, is created also the people to come, David saying, *This shall be written for another generation, and the people that shall be created shall praise the Lord.* And again in the twenty-first Psalm, *They shall come, and the heavens shall declare His righteousness, unto a people that shall be born whom the Lord hath made.* For we shall no more hear, *In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;* but, *Where I am, there ye* shall *be also;* so that we may say, *We are His workmanship, created unto good* works. Ed. Ben. ii. § 64—66.

197. And again, since God's work, that is, man, though created perfect, has become wanting through the transgression, and dead in sin, and it was unbecoming that the work of God should remain imperfect, (hence all the saints beseech concerning this, for instance in the hundred and thirty-seventh Psalm, saying, *The Lord shall make good His loving-kindness towards me; despise not then the works of Thine own hands;)* therefore the perfect Word of God puts around Him an imperfect body, and is said to be created *for the works;* that, paying the debt in our stead, He might, by Himself, perfect what was wanting to man. Now immortality was wanting to him, and the way to paradise. This then is what our Saviour says, *I have glorified Thee on the earth, I have perfected the work which*

CH. XXII. *Thou gavest Me to do;* and again, *The works which the Father hath given Me to perform, the same works that I do, bear witness of Me;* but *the works* He here says that the Father had given Him to perfect, are those for which He is created, saying in the Proverbs, *The Lord hath created Me a beginning of His ways, for His works;* for it is all one to say, *The Father hath given Me the works*, and *The Lord hath created Me for the works.*

198. When then received He the works to perfect, O God's enemies? for this also will throw light on *He created.* If ye say, "At the beginning when He brought them into being out of what was not," this is not true; for they were not yet made; whereas He appears to speak as undertaking what was already in being. Nor is it pious in answer to refer to a time previous to the Word's becoming flesh, lest His coming should thereupon seem superfluous, since for the sake of these works that coming took place. Therefore it remains for us to say that when He became man, then He took the works. For then He perfected them, by healing our wounds and vouchsafing to us the resurrection from the dead. But if, when the Word became flesh, then were committed to Him the works, plainly when He became man, then also is He created for the works. Not of His substance then is this phrase "*He created*" indicative, as has many times been said, but of His bodily coming into being. For then, because God's works were become imperfect and mutilated from the transgression, He is said in respect to the body to be created; that by perfecting them and making them whole, He might present the Church unto the Father, as the Apostle says, *not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but holy and without blemish.* Mankind then is perfected in Him and restored, as it was made at the beginning, nay, with greater grace. For, on rising from the dead, we shall no longer fear death, but shall ever reign in Christ in the heavens.

199. And this has been done, since the proper Word of God Himself, who is from the Father, has put on the flesh, and become man. For if, being a creature, He had become man, man had remained just what he was, not joined to God; for how had a work been joined to the Creator by a work? or what succour had come from like to like, when one as well as the other needed it? And how, were the Word a creature, had He power to undo God's sentence, and to remit sin, whereas it is written in the Prophets that this is God's doing? For *who is a God like unto Thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by transgression?* For whereas, God having said, *Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return*, men have become mortal, how then could things which were created undo sin? but the Lord is He who has undone it, as He says Himself, *Unless the Son shall make you free;* and the Son, who made free, has shown in truth that He is no creature, nor one of things brought into being, but the proper Word and Image of the Father's Substance, who at the beginning sentenced, and alone remitteth sins. For since by the Word it was said, *Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return*, suitably it is through the Word Himself and in Him that the freedom and the undoing of the condemnation has come to pass. ED. BEN. ii. § 66—68.

200. "Yet," they say, "supposing the Saviour were a creature, God surely by speaking the word only could undo the curse." And so another will tell them in like manner, "Without His incarnation at all, God was able just to speak and undo the curse;" but we must consider what was expedient for mankind, and not what simply is possible with God. He could have destroyed, before the ark of Noah, the then transgressors; but He did it after the ark. He could too, without Moses, have spoken the word only, and have brought the people out of Egypt; but it profited to do it through Moses. And God was able without the judges to save His people; but it was profitable for the

CH. XXII. people that for a season judges should be raised up to them. The Saviour too might have come among us from the beginning, or on His coming might not have been delivered to Pilate; but He came *at the fulness of the ages*, and only when sought for said, *I am He.* For what He does, that is profitable for men, and was not fitting in any other way; and what is profitable and fitting, for that He provides. Accordingly He came, not *that He might be ministered unto, but that He might minister*, and might work our salvation. Certainly He was able to speak the Law from heaven, but He saw that it was expedient to men for Him to speak from Sinai; and this He did, that it might be possible for Moses to go up, and for them, hearing the word near them, the rather to believe. Moreover, with what good reason He acted may be seen thus: if God had simply spoken, because that was in His power, and so the curse had been undone, the power had been shown of Him who gave the word, but man, though restored to what Adam was before the transgression, had received grace only from without,[5] and not had it united to his body; such would he have been, but, so restored to Paradise, perhaps he had become worse, because he had learned to transgress. Such then being his condition, had he again been seduced by the serpent, there had been fresh need for God to give command and undo the curse; and thus the need had become interminable, and men had remained under guilt not less than before, as being enslaved to sin; and ever sinning, would have ever needed one to pardon them, and had never become free, being in flesh themselves, and ever worsted by the Law because of the infirmity of the flesh.

201. Again, if the Son were a creature, man had remained mortal as before, not being joined to God; for a creature

[5] Vid. Append. *Grace.*

would not have joined creatures to God, as itself seeking what would join them; nor could any portion of the creation have been the creation's salvation, as needing salvation itself. To provide against this also, He sends His own Son, who becomes Son of Man by taking created flesh; that, since all men were under sentence of death, He, being other than them all, might Himself for all offer to death His own body; and that henceforth, all having died in Him, the word of that sentence might be accomplished, (for *all died* in Christ,) and that all through Him might thereupon become free from sin and from the curse which came upon sin, and might truly abide for ever, risen from the dead and clothed in immortality and incorruption. For, the Word being clothed in the flesh, as has many times been explained, every wound which the serpent had inflicted was absolutely staunched; and whatever evil sprang from the motions of the flesh henceforth was cut away, and with these death also was abolished, the companion of sin, as the Lord Himself says, *The prince of this world cometh, and findeth nothing in Me;* and *For this end was He manifested*, as John has written, *that He might destroy the works of the devil.* And these being destroyed from out the flesh, we all were thus liberated as regards our relationship with that flesh, and henceforward are joined, even we, to the Word. And being joined to God, no longer have we earth for our home; but, as He Himself has said, where He is there shall we be also; and henceforward we shall fear no longer the serpent, for he was brought to nought when he was assailed by the Saviour in the flesh, and heard Him say, *Get thee behind Me, Satan*, and thus he is cast out of paradise into the eternal fire. Nor shall we have to watch against woman[6] seducing us, for *in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the*

ED. BEN. ii. § 68—69.

[6] i.e., as in the instance of Eve.

CH. XXII. *Angels;* and in Christ Jesus it shall be *a new creation*, and *neither male nor female, but all and in all Christ;* and where Christ is, what fear, what danger can still happen? But this would not have come to pass had the Word been a creature; for with a creature the devil, himself a creature, would have ever continued the battle, and man, being between the two, had been ever in peril of death, not having one in whom and through whom he might be joined to God and delivered from all fear.

202. Whence truth shows us that the Word is not of the things which came into being, but rather is Himself their Framer. For therefore did He assume the body created and human, that having renewed it as its Framer, He might deify it in Himself, and thus might introduce us all into the kingdom of heaven after His likeness. For man had not been made god anew if joined to a creature, nor unless the Son were very God; nor had man stood in the Father's presence unless it had been His natural and true Word who stood clad in that body which belonged to man. And, as we had not been freed from sin and the curse, had it not been human flesh in its nature which the Word put on, (for we should have had nothing common with what was foreign,) so also man had not been made god, unless the Word who became man had in His nature been from the Father and true and proper to Him. For therefore was the union such, in order that He might unite what is man by nature to Him who is in the nature of the Godhead, and man's salvation and deification might be sure. Therefore, let those who deny that the Son is from the Father by nature and proper to His Substance, deny also that He took true human flesh of Mary Ever-Virgin; for in neither case had it been of profit to us men, whether the Word were not true and naturally Son of God, or the flesh not true which He assumed. But surely He took true flesh, though Valentinus rave; and

the Word was by nature Very God, though Ario- maniacs rave; and in that flesh He has become the beginning of our new creation, He being created man for our sake, and having made for us that new way, as has been said.

203. The Word then is neither creature nor work; for "creature," "thing made," "work," are all one; and were He creature and thing made, He would also be a work. Accordingly He has not said, "He created Me as a work," nor "He made me with the works," lest He should appear to be in nature and substance a creature; nor, "He created Me to make works," lest on the other hand, according to the perverseness of the impious, He should be accounted as an instrument made for our sake. Nor again has He declared, "He created Me before the works," lest, as He really is before all, as an Offspring, so, if created also before the works, He should give one and the same sense to "Offspring" and to *He created.* But He has said with exact discrimination, *unto* or *into the works;* as if to say, "The Father has made Me *into* flesh, that I might be man," —which again shows that He is not a work, but an offspring, for as He who comes into a house, is not part of the house, but is other than the house, so He who is created *unto* the works, must be by nature distinct from the works.

204. But if otherwise, as you hold, O Arians, the Word of God be a work, by what Hand and Wisdom did He Himself come into being? for all things that came to be, came by the Hand and Wisdom of God, who Himself says, *My Hand hath made all these things;* and David says in the Psalm, *And Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the work of Thy Hands;* and again, in the hundred and forty-second Psalm, *I do remember the time past, I muse upon all Thy works, yea I exercise myself in the works of Thy Hands.* Therefore, if by the Hand of God the works are wrought, and it is written that *all things were made through the Word,*

Ch. XXII. and *without Him was made not one thing*, and again, *One Lord Jesus, through whom are all things*, and *in Him all things consist*, it is very plain that the Son cannot be a work, but He is the Hand of God and the Wisdom. This knowing, the martyrs in Babylon, Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, arraign the Arian impiety. For when they say, *O all ye works of the Lord, bless ye the Lord*, they recount things in heaven, things on earth, and the whole creation, as works; but the Son they name not. For they say not, "Bless, O Word, and praise, O Wisdom;" in order to show that all other things are both engaged in praise and are works; but the Word is not a work nor of those that praise, but is praised with the Father and worshipped and confessed as God, being His Word and Wisdom, and of the works the Framer.

205. This too the Spirit has declared in the Psalms with a most apposite distinction, *the Word of the Lord is true, and all His works are faithful;* as in another Psalm too He says, *O Lord, how great are Thy works! in Wisdom hast Thou made them all.* But if the Word were a work, then certainly He as others had been made in Wisdom; nor would Scripture have distinguished Him from the works, nor, while it named the one as works, would have revealed Him as Word and proper Wisdom of God. But, as it is, distinguishing Him from the works, Scripture shows that Wisdom is Framer of the works, and not a work. This distinction Paul also observes, writing to the Hebrews, *The Word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, reaching even to the dividing of soul and spirit, joints and marrow, and a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart, neither is there any creation hidden before Him, but all things are naked and open unto the eyes of Him with whom is our account.* For behold He calls things which came into being "creation;" but the Son he recognises as the Word of God, as if He were other than the creatures.

And again saying, *All things are naked and open to the eyes of Him with whom is our account*, He signifies that He is other than all of them. For hence it is that it is He that is judge, but each of all created things is bound to give account to Him. And so also, whereas the whole creation is groaning together with us in order to be set free from the bondage of corruption, the Son is thereby shown to be other than the creatures. For if He were creature, He too would be one of those who groan, and would need one who should bring adoption and deliverance to Himself as well as others. And if the whole creation groans together, for the sake of freedom from the bondage of corruption, therefore the Son is not of those that groan nor of those who need freedom, but He it is who gives sonship and freedom to all, saying to the Jews of His time, *The servant remains not in the house for ever, but the Son remaineth for ever; if then the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed;* from these considerations also it is clearer than the light, that the Word of God is not a creature but true Son, and by nature genuine, of the Father. Concerning then *The Lord hath created Me a beginning of the ways*, this, though in few words, is sufficient, as I think, to afford matter to the learned to frame more ample refutations of the Arian heresy. Ed. Ben. ii. § 71—72.

Chapter XXIII.

Answer to objections from Scripture; sixthly, the context of Proverbs viii. 22, *viz.*, 22—30.

206. But since the heretics, reading the following verse, take a perverse view of it as well as of the preceding, because it is written, *He founded Me before the world*, namely, that this is said of the divinity of the Word and not of His

CH. XXIII. incarnate Presence, it is necessary, by explaining this verse also, to show their error.

207. It is written, *The Lord in Wisdom hath founded the earth;* if then by Wisdom the earth is founded, how can He who founds be founded? nay, this too is said after the manner of proverbs, and we must in like manner investigate its sense. The question is, "He founded Me" to be what? Does he mean "He founded Me" to be Son? or "founded Me" to become beginning and foundation of our new creation and renewal? This is the point. Let it be observed then, that here as before, He says not, "Before the world He hath made Me Word or Son," lest there should be a making and a beginning. For this, as before, we must seek before all things, whether He is Son, and on this point specially search the Scriptures; for this it was, when the Apostles were questioned, that Peter answered, saying, *Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God.* This also the father of the Arian heresy asked, as one of his first questions: *If Thou be the Son of God;* for he knew that this is the truth and the sovereign principle of our faith; and that, if He were the Son, the tyranny of the devil would have its end; but if He were a creature, He too was no more than one of those descended from that Adam whom he deceived, and he might make himself easy. For the same reason the Jews of the day were angered, because the Lord said that He was Son of God, and that God was His proper Father. For had He called Himself one of the creatures, or said, "I am a work," they had not been startled at the intelligence, nor thought such words blasphemy, knowing, as they did, that Angels too had come among their fathers; but since He called Himself Son, they perceived that such was not the note of a creature, but of Godhead and of the Father's nature. The Arians then ought, even in imitation of their own father the devil, to take some special pains on this point; and if

He said, "He founded Me to be Word or Son," then to think as they do; but if He has not so spoken, not to invent for themselves what is not to be found. Ed. Ben. ii. § 72—74.

208. For He says not, "Before the world He founded Me as Word or Son," but simply, *He founded Me*, to show again, as I have said, that not for His own sake but for those who are built upon Him does He here also speak, after the way of proverbs. For this knowing, the Apostle also writes, *Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ; but let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon.* And it must be that the foundation should be such as the things built on it, that they may admit of being well compacted together. Being then the Word, He has not, as far as Word, any beings such as Himself, who may be compacted with Him; for He is Only-begotten; but having become man, He has the like of man, of those namely the likeness of whose flesh He has put on. Therefore it is according to His manhood that He is *founded*, that we, as precious stones, may admit of building upon Him, and may become a temple of the Holy Ghost who dwelleth in us. And as He is a foundation, and we stones built upon Him, so again He is a Vine, and we knit to Him as branches,—not according to the Substance of the Godhead; for this surely is impossible; but according to His manhood, for the branches must be like the Vine, since we are like Him according to the flesh.

209. Moreover, since the heretics have such human notions, we may suitably confute them with human resemblances contained in the very matter they urge. Thus He saith not, "He hath made Me a foundation," lest He might seem to be made and to have a beginning of being, and they might thence find an audacious pretence for impiety; but, *He hath founded Me.* Now what is founded is founded for the sake of the stones which are raised upon it; it is not a random process, but a stone is first transported from the

CH. XXIII. mountain and set down in the depth of the earth. And while a stone is in the mountain, it is not yet founded; but when need demands, and it be transported, and laid in the depth of the earth, then forthwith if the stone could speak, it would say, "Now he has founded me, who has brought me hither from the mountain." Therefore the Lord also did not when founded take a beginning of existence; for He was the Word before that; but when He put on our body, which He severed and took from Mary, then He says, *He hath founded Me;* as much as to say, "Me, being the Word, He hath enveloped in a body of earth." For so He is founded for our sakes, taking on Him what is ours, that we, as incorporated and compacted and bound together in Him through the likeness of the flesh, may attain unto a perfect man, and abide immortal and incorruptible.

210. Nor let the words *before the world* and *before He made the earth* and *before the mountains were settled* disturb any one; for they very well accord with *founded* and *created;* for here again allusion is made to the Economy according to the flesh. For though the grace which has come to us from the Saviour has but lately appeared, as the Apostle says, and took place when He came among us, yet this grace had been prepared even before we came into being, nay, before the foundation of the world; and the reason why, is excellent and wonderful. It beseemed not that God should counsel concerning us afterwards, lest He should appear ignorant of our future. The God of all then, creating us by His own Word, and knowing our destinies better than we, and foreseeing that, though created *good*, we should in the event be transgressors of the commandment, and be thrust out of paradise for disobedience, He, being loving and kind, prepared beforehand in His proper Word, by whom also He created us, the Economy of our salvation; that though by the serpent's deceit we fell from Him, we might

not remain altogether dead, but having in the Word the redemption and salvation which was afore prepared for us, we might rise again and abide immortal, when He should have been created for us *a beginning of the ways*, and when He who was the *First-born of creation* should become *first-born* of His *brethren*, and again should rise *first-fruits of the dead.*

211. This Paul the blessed Apostle teaches in his writings; for, as interpreting the words of The Proverbs *before the world* and *before the earth* He *was* made, he thus speaks to Timothy: *Be partaker of the afflictions of the Gospel according to the power of God, who hath saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, but is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death and brought life to light.* And to the Ephesians: *Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessing in heavenly places in Christ Jesus, according as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love, having predestinated us to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself.* How then has He chosen us, before we came into existence, but that, as He says Himself, in Him we were represented beforehand? and how at all, before men were created, did He predestinate us unto adoption, but that the Son Himself was *founded before the world*, taking on Him that economy which was for our sake? or how, as the Apostle goes on to say, have we *an inheritance, being predestinated to it*, save that the Lord Himself was founded *before the world*, inasmuch as He had a purpose, for our sakes, to take on Him through the flesh all that inheritance of adverse judgment which lay against us, and henceforth to make us sons in Him? and

CH. XXIII. how did we receive it *before eternal times*, when we were not yet in being, but afterwards in time, save that in Christ was stored the grace which has reached us? Wherefore also in the Judgment, when every one shall receive according to his conduct, He says, *Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.* How then, or in whom, was it prepared before we came to be, save in the Lord who *before the world* was founded for this purpose; that we, as built upon Him, might partake, as well-compacted stones, the life and grace which is from Him?

212. And this took place, as naturally suggests itself to the religious mind, in order, as I said, that we, rising after our brief death, may be capable of an eternal life, of which we had not been capable, men as we are, formed of earth, except that *before the world* there had been prepared for us in Christ the hope of life and salvation. Therefore good reason is there that the Word, who was to enter into our flesh, and to be created in it as *a beginning of ways for His works*, should withal be laid as a foundation, according as the Father's will was determined in Him before the ages, as has been said, and before land was, and before the mountains were settled, and before the fountains burst forth; that, though the earth and the mountains and the forms of visible nature pass away in the fulness of the present age, we on the contrary may not grow old after their pattern, but may be able to live after them, having the spiritual life and blessing which have been prepared for us before these things in the Word Himself according to election. For thus we shall be capable of a life not temporary, but may ever afterwards abide and live in Christ, since even before our own time our life had been founded and prepared in Christ Jesus.

213. Nor in any other was it fitting that our life should be founded, except in the Lord who is before the ages,

and through whom the ages were brought to be; that, since that everlasting life was in Him, we too might be able to inherit it. For God is good; and being good always, He willed this as knowing that our weak nature needed the succour and salvation which is from Him. And as a skilled architect, proposing to build a house, anticipates also his repairing it, in case it should at any future time become dilapidated after building, and, as counselling about this, makes preparation from the first, and gives to the workman materials for a repair; and thus the means of the repair are provided before the house is built; in the same way, prior to us is the repair of our salvation founded in Christ, that in Him also we might be new-created. And the will and the purpose were ready *before the world;* but the work took place when the need required, and the Saviour came among us. For the Lord Himself will stand us in place of all things in the heavens, when He receives us into everlasting life. Ed. Ben. ii. § 76—77.

214. This then is quite enough to prove that the Word of God is not a creature, but that the doctrine of this passage is concordant with orthodoxy. But since the passage, when scrutinised, has an orthodox sense in every point of view, it may be well to state what that large sense is; for perhaps many words may prevail with these men. Now to do this I must here recur to what has been said before, for what I have to say relates to the same proverb and the same Wisdom. The Word then has not called Himself a creature by nature, but has said in proverbs, *The Lord created Me;* and He plainly indicates a sense not spoken openly but latent, such as we shall be able to find by taking away the veil from the proverb. I do not shrink from calling it a dark saying; but *a man of understanding*, says the sacred writer, *shall understand a proverb and the interpretation, the words of the wise and their dark sayings.*

215. Now the Only-begotten and Auto-Wisdom of God

CH. XXIII. is Creator and Framer of all things; for *in Wisdom hast Thou made them all*, He says, and *the earth is full of Thy creation*. But that what came into being might not only be, but be good, it pleased God that His own Wisdom should condescend to the creatures, so as to introduce an impression and semblance of Its Image on all of them in common and on each, that what was made might be manifestly wise works and worthy of God. For as of the Son of God, considered as the Word, our word is an image, so of the same Son, considered as Wisdom, is the wisdom which is implanted in us an image; in which wisdom we, having the power of knowledge and thought, become recipients of the All-framing Wisdom; and through It we are able to know Its Father. *For he who hath the Son*, saith He, *hath the Father also;* and *he that receiveth Me, receiveth Him that sent Me.* Such an impression then of Wisdom being created in us, and being in all the works, with reason does the true and framing Wisdom take to Itself what belongs to Its own impression, and say, *The Lord created Me for His works;* for what the wisdom in us says, that the Lord Himself speaks as if it were His own; and, whereas He is not Himself created, being Creator, yet because of the image of Him created in the works, He says this as if of Himself. And as the Lord Himself has said, *He that receiveth you, receiveth Me*, because His impression is in us, so, though He be not among the creatures, yet because His image and impression is created in the works, He says, as if in His own person, *The Lord created Me a beginning of His ways for His works.* And therefore has this impression of Wisdom in the works been brought into being, that, as I said before, the world might recognise in it its own Creator the Word, and through Him the Father. And this is what Paul said, *Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them, for God has showed it unto them: for the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are*

clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made. But if so, the Word is not a creature in substance; but the wisdom which is in us, and so called, is spoken of in this passage in the Proverbs. Ed. Ben. ii. §78–79.

216. But if this too fails to persuade them, let them tell us themselves, whether there is any wisdom in the creatures or not? If not, how is it that the Apostle complains, *For after that in the Wisdom of God the world by Wisdom knew not God?* or how is it, if there is no wisdom, that a *multitude of wise men* are found in Scripture? for *a wise man feareth and departeth from evil;* and *through wisdom is a house builded;* and the Preacher says, *A man's wisdom maketh his face to shine;* and he blames those who are headstrong thus, *Say not thou, what is the cause that the former days were better than these? for thou dost not inquire wisely concerning this.* But if, as the Son of Sirach says, *He poured her out upon all His works; she is with all flesh according to His gift, and He hath given her to them that love Him,* and if this outpouring is a note, not of the Substance of the Very Wisdom and Only-begotten, but of that wisdom which is imaged in the world, how is it incredible that the All-framing and true Wisdom Itself, whose impression is the wisdom and knowledge poured out in the world, should say, as I have already explained, as if of Itself, *The Lord hath created Me for His works?*

217. For the wisdom in the world is not creative, but is that which is created in the works, according to which *the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handiwork.* This if men have within them, they will acknowledge the true Wisdom of God; and will know that they are made really after God's Image. And, as some son of a king, when the father wished to build a city, might cause his own name to be printed upon each of the works that were rising, both to give security to them

CH. XXIII. that the works would remain, by reason of the mark of his name on everything, and also to make them remember him and his father from the name, and having finished the city might be asked concerning it, how it was made, and then would answer, "It is made securely, for according to the will of my father, I am imaged in every work, for there is a creation of my name in the works;" but saying this, he does not signify that his own substance is created, but the impression of himself by means of his name; in the same manner, to apply the illustration, to those who admire the wisdom in the creatures, the true Wisdom makes answer, *The Lord hath created Me for the works*, for My impress is in them; and I have thus condescended for the framing of all things.

218. Moreover, that the son should be speaking of the impress that is within us as if it were Himself, should not startle any one, considering (for we must not care about repetition) that, when Saul was persecuting the Church, in which was His impression and image, He said, as if He were Himself under persecution, *Saul, why persecutest thou Me?* Therefore, (as has been said,) just as, supposing the impression itself of Wisdom which is in the works had said, *The Lord hath created Me for the works*, no one would have been startled; so, if He, the True and Framing Wisdom, the Only-begotten Word of God, should use what belongs to His image as about Himself, namely, *The Lord hath created Me for the works*, let no one, overlooking the wisdom created in the world and in the works, think that *He created* is said of the Substance of the Very Wisdom, lest, diluting the wine with water,[7] he be judged a defrauder of the truth. For Wisdom is Creator and Framer; but Its impression is created in the works, as the copy of an image.

219. And He says, *Beginning of ways*, since such wisdom

[7] Vid. pp. 26, 401.

becomes a sort of beginning, and, as it were, a rudiment of the knowledge of God; for a man entering, as it were, upon this way first, and keeping it in the fear of God, (as Solomon says, *The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom*,) then advancing upwards in his thoughts and perceiving the Framing Wisdom which is in the creation, will perceive in It also Its Father, as the Lord Himself has said, *He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father*, and as John writes, *He who acknowledgeth the Son, hath the Father also*. And He says, *Before the world hath He founded Me*, since in Its impression the works remain settled and eternal. Then, lest any, hearing concerning the wisdom thus created in the works, should think the true Wisdom, God's Son, to be by nature a creature, He has found it necessary to add, *Before the mountains, and before the earth, and before the waters, and before all hills, He begets Me*, that in saying, "before all creation," (for He includes all the creation under these heads,) He may show that He is not created together with the works according to substance. For if He was created *for the works*, yet is before them, it follows that He is in being before He was created. He is not then a creature by nature and substance, but as He Himself has added, an Offspring. But in what differs a creature from an offspring, and how it is distinct by nature, has been shown in what has gone before. Ed. Ben. ii. § 79—81.

220. Moreover, if He proceeds to say, *When He prepared the heaven, I was present with Him*, He must not be supposed to say this as if it was without Wisdom that the Father prepared the heaven or the clouds above; but this is what He says, "All things took place in Me and through Me, and when there was need that Wisdom should be created in the works, in My Substance indeed I was with the Father, but by a condescension to creatures, I was engaged in diffusing over the works My own impression, so that the whole world, as being in one body, might

CH. XXIII. not be at variance but in concord with itself." All those then who with an upright understanding, according to the wisdom given unto them, come to contemplate the creatures, are able to say for themselves, "By Thy appointment all things continue;" but they who make light of this, must be told, *Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools;* for *that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God has revealed it unto them; for the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal Power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse. Because that when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, but served the creature more than the Creator of all, who is blessed for ever. Amen.*

221. And they will feel some compunction surely at the words, *For after that in the wisdom of God*, (in the mode we have explained above,) *the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.* For no longer, as in the former times, has God willed to be known by a mere image and shadow of wisdom, that namely which is in the creatures, but He has made the true Wisdom Itself to take flesh, and to become man, and to undergo the death of the cross; that by their faith in Him henceforth all that believe may obtain salvation. However, it is the same Wisdom of God, which in the first instance by means of Its own Image in the creatures, (whence also it is said to be created,) manifested first Itself, and through Itself Its own Father; and afterwards, being Itself the Word, *became flesh*, as John says, and after abolishing death and saving our race, still further revealed Himself and through Him His own Father, saying, *Grant unto them that they may know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.*

222. Hence the whole earth is filled with the knowledge of Him; for the knowledge of Father through Son and of Son from Father is one and the same, and the Father delights in Him, and in that joy the Son rejoices in the Father, saying, *I was by Him, daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him.* And this again proves that the Son is not foreign, but proper to the Father's Substance. For behold, not because of us has He come into being, as they say, nor is He made out of nothing, (for not from without did God procure for Himself a cause of rejoicing,) but the words denote what is proper and like. When then was it that the Father rejoiced not? but if He ever rejoiced, He too was ever, in whom He rejoiced. And in whom does the Father rejoice, except as seeing Himself in His proper Image, which is His Word? And though in sons of men also He had delight, on His finishing the world, as it is written in these same Proverbs, yet this too has a consistent sense. For even in this case He had delight, not with a joy which came to Him from without, but again as seeing the works made after His own Image; so that even this rejoicing of God is on account of His Image. And how too has the Son delight, except as seeing Himself in the Father? for this is the same as saying, *He that hath seen Me, hath seen the Father*, and *I am in the Father and the Father in Me.* Ed. Ben. ii. § 81—82.

223. Vain then is your vaunt, as is on all sides shown, O Christ's enemies, and vainly do ye trumpet forth[8] and circulate everywhere your text, *The Lord hath created Me a beginning of His ways*, perverting its sense, and publishing, not Solomon's meaning, but your own comment. For

[8] ἐνεπομπεύσατε. "The ancients said πομπεύειν, 'to use bad language,' and the coarse language of the procession, πομπεία. This arose from the custom of persons in the Bacchanalian cars using bad language towards bystanders, and their retorting it." Erasm. Adag. p. 1158. He quotes Menander'—
ἐπὶ τῶν ἁμαξῶν εἰσὶ πομπεῖαί τινες σφόδρα λοίδοροι.

CH. XXIII. behold your meaning is proved to be but a phantasy; for the passage in the Proverbs, as well as all that is above said, proves that the Son is not a creature in nature and substance, but the proper Offspring of the Father, true Wisdom and Word, by whom *all things were made*, and *without Him was made not one thing*.

DISCOURSE III.

CHAPTER XXIV.

Answer to objections from Scripture; seventhly, John xiv. 10.

224. THE Ario-maniacs, when the passages which they allege, *The Lord created Me*, and *Made better than the Angels*, and *First-born*, and *Faithful to Him that made Him*, are shown to have an orthodox meaning, and to inculcate piety towards Christ, therefore, as if bedewed with the serpent's poison, not seeing what they ought to see, nor understanding what they read, as if bursting forth from the depth of their impious hearts, have next proceeded to disparage our Lord's words, *I in the Father and the Father in Me;* saying, "How can the One be contained in the Other and the Other in the One?" or "How at all can the Father who is the greater be contained in the Son who is the less?" or "What wonder, if the Son is in the Father, considering it certainly is written of us too, *In Him we live and move and have our being?*" And this state of mind is in keeping with the perverseness of men who think God to be material, and understand not what is signified by "True Father" and "True Son," by "Light Invisible" and "Eternal," and Its "Radiance Invisible," nor "Invisible Subsistence," and "Immaterial Impress" and "Immaterial Image." For had they known, they would not have dishonoured and ridiculed the Lord of glory, nor, interpreting things

ED. BEN. iii. § 1.

CH. XXIV. immaterial after a material manner, perverted good words.

225. It were sufficient indeed, on only hearing words which are the Lord's, at once to believe, since the faith of simplicity is better than an elaborate process of persuasion; but since they have endeavoured to desecrate even this passage for the ends of their personal heresy, it becomes necessary to expose their perverseness and to show the purpose of the truth, at least for the security of the faithful. For when it is said, *I in the Father and the Father in Me*, They are not therefore, as these suppose, pouring Each into Other, filling Each Other, as in the case of empty vessels, so that the Son fills the emptiness of the Father and the Father that of the Son, and Each of Them by Himself is not complete and perfect, (for this is proper to bodies, and therefore the mere assertion of it is full of impiety,) for the Father is full and perfect, and the Son is the Fulness of Godhead. Nor again, as God, by coming into the Saints, strengthens them, so is it that He is also in the Son. For the Son is Himself the Father's Power and Wisdom, and by partaking of Him things created are sanctified in the Spirit; but the Son Himself is not Son by participation,[1] but is the Father's proper Offspring. Nor again, is the Son in the Father, in the sense of the passage, *In Him we live and move and have our being;* for, He as being from the Fount of the Father is the Life, in which all things are both quickened and consist; for the Life does not live in life, else it would not be Life, but rather He gives life to all things.

226. But now let us see what Asterius the Sophist says, the retained[2] pleader for the heresy. In imitation then of the Jews so far, he writes as follows: "It is very plain that He has said, that He is in the Father and the Father again in Him, for this reason, that neither the word, on

[1] Vid. App. *μετουσία.* [2] Vid. App. *Asterius.*

which He was discoursing is, as He says, His own, but the Father's, nor the works belong to Him, but to the Father who gave Him the power." Now this, if uttered at random by a little child, had been excused from his age; but when one who bears the title of Sophist, and professes universal knowledge,[3] is the writer, what a serious condemnation does he deserve? And does he not show himself a stranger to the Apostle, as being puffed up with persuasive words of wisdom, and thinking thereby to succeed in deceiving, *not understanding himself what he saith nor whereof he affirms?* For what the Son has said, as being proper and suitable to a Son only, who is Word and Wisdom and Image of the Father's Substance, this he brings to the level of all the creatures, and makes common to the Son and to them; and he says, lawless[4] man, that the Power of the Father receives power, that by means of this impiety it may be open to him to say that in a Son the Son was made a son, and the Word received a Word's authority; and, far from granting that He spoke this truth thus as a Son, he ranks Him with all things made, as having learned it as they have. For if the Son said, *I am in the Father and the Father in Me*, because His discourses were not His own words but the Father's, and so of His works, then, since David says, *I will hear what the Lord shall say in me*, and again Solomon, *My words are spoken by God*, and since Moses was minister of words which were from God, and since each of the Prophets spoke not what was his own but what was from God, *Thus saith the Lord*, and since the works of the Saints were, as they professed, not their own but God's

ED. BEN. iii. § 1—2.

[3] *πάντα γινώσκειν ἐπαγγελλόμενος.* Gorgias according to Cicero de Fin. ii. init. was the first who ventured in public to say *προβάλλετε*, "give me a question." This was the *ἐπάγγελμα* of the Sophists, of which Aristotle speaks, ascribing to Protagoras the "profession" of being able to "make the worse cause the better." Rhet. ii. 24 fin. Vid. Cressol. Theatr. Rhet. iii. 11.

[4] *παράνομος*, Hist. Ar. 71, 75, 79. Ep. Æg. 16, d. Vid. *ἄνομος*, 2 Thess. ii. 8.

CH. XXIV. who gave the power, (Elias for instance and Eliseus invoking God that He Himself would raise the dead, and Eliseus saying to Naaman, on cleansing him from the leprosy, *that thou mayest know that there is a God in Israel*,[5] and Samuel too in the days of the harvest praying to God to grant rain, and the Apostles saying that not in their own power they did miracles but in the Lord's grace,) it is plain that, according to Asterius, such a statement as that in question must belong to all, so that each of them is able to say, *I in the Father and the Father in me;* and as a consequence that He is no longer One Son of God and Word and Wisdom, but, as others, is only one out of many.

227. But if the Lord said this, His words would not rightly have been, *I in the Father and the Father in Me*, but rather, "I also am in the Father and the Father also is in Me," that He may have nothing proper and by prerogative, relatively to the Father, as being a Son, but the same grace in common with all. But it is not so, as they think; for not understanding that there is a genuine Son from the Father, they belie that genuine Son, whom only it befits to say, *I in the Father and the Father in Me.* For the Son is in the Father, as it is allowed us to apprehend, because the whole Being of the Son is proper to the Father's substance, as radiance from light, and stream from fountain; so that whoso sees the Son, sees that which is the Father's, and apprehends that the Son's Being, because from the Father, is therefore in the Father. For the Father is in the Son, since the Son is what is from the Father and proper to Him, as in the radiance the sun, and in the word the thought, and in the stream the fountain: for whoso thus contemplates the Son, contemplates what

[5] ἐξαίρετον, vid. supr. p. 274, iv. § 28. init. Euseb. Eccl. Theol. pp. 47, b. 73, b. 89, b. 124, a. 129, c. Theodor. Hist. p. 732 Nyss. contr. Eunom. iii. p. 133, a. Epiph. Hær. 76, p. 970. Cyril. Thes. p. 160.

belongs to the Father's substance, and apprehends that the Father is in the Son. For whereas the countenance and Godhead of the Father is the Being of the Son, it follows that the Son is in the Father and the Father in the Son. Ed. Ben. iii. § 2—4.

228. On this account and reasonably, having said before, *I and the Father are One*, He added, *I in the Father and the Father in Me*, by way of showing the identity of Godhead and the unity of Substance. For They are one, not as one thing which divides into two, and after all is nothing but one, nor as one thing twice named, so that the Same becomes at one time Father, at another His own Son, for Sabellius holding this was judged an heretic. But They are two, because the Father is Father and is not also Son, and the Son is Son and not also Father; but the nature is one; (for the offspring is not unlike its parent, for it is his image,) and all that is the Father's is the Son's. Wherefore neither is the Son another God, for He is not to be imagined as external, else were there many godheads; for if the Son be other, considered as an Offspring, still He is the Same, considered as God; and He and the Father are one in that nature which is proper and peculiar to Each, and in the identity of the one Godhead, as has been said. For the radiance also is light, not second to the sun, nor a different light, nor from participation of it, but a whole and proper offspring of it. And such an offspring is necessarily one light; and no one would say that they are two lights, but sun and radiance two, yet one the light from the sun enlightening in its radiance things everywhere. So also the Godhead of the Son is the Father's; whence also it is indivisible; and thus there is one God and none other but He. And so, since they are one, and the Godhead itself one, the same things are said of the Son which are said of the Father, except His being said to be Father:—for instance, that He is God, *And the*

CH. XXIV. *Word was God;* that He is Almighty, *Thus said* ——— *He which was and is and is to come, the Almighty;* Lord, *One Lord Jesus Christ;* that He is Light, *I am the Light;* that He forgives sins, *that ye may know*, He says, *that the Son of man hath power upon earth to forgive sins;* and so with other attributes. For *all things*, says the Son Himself, *whatsoever the Father hath, are Mine;* and again, *And Mine are Thine.* And on hearing the attributes of the Father predicated of the Son, we shall thereby see the Father in the Son; and we shall contemplate the Son in the Father, whenever what is said of the Son is said of the Father also. And why are the attributes of the Father ascribed to the Son, except that the Son is an Offspring from Him? and why are the Son's attributes proper to the Father, except again because the Son is the proper Offspring of His Substance? And the Son, being the proper Offspring of the Father's Substance, reasonably says that the Father's attributes are His own also; whence suitably and consistently with saying, *I and the Father are One*, He adds, *that ye may know that I am in the Father and the Father in Me.*

229. Moreover, He has added this again, *He that hath seen Me, hath seen the Father;* and there is one and the same sense in these three passages. For he who in this sense understands that the Son and the Father are one, knows that He is in the Father and the Father in the Son; for the Godhead of the Son is the Father's, and this is in the Son; and whoso enters into this, is convinced that *He that hath seen the Son, hath seen the Father;* for in the Son is contemplated the Father's Godhead. And we may perceive this more intimately from the illustration of the Emperor's image. For in the image is the face and form of the Emperor, and in the Emperor is that face which is in the image. For the likeness of the Emperor in the image is intimately exact;[6] so that a person who looks at the image,

[6] Vid. App. ἀπαράλλακτος.

sees in it the Emperor; and he again who sees the Emperor, recognises that it is he who is in the image. And from the likeness not differing, to one who after the image wished to view the Emperor, the image might say, "I and the Emperor are one; for I am in him, and he in me; and what thou seest in me, that thou beholdest in him, and what thou hast seen in him, that thou beholdest in me." Accordingly he who worships the image, in it worships the Emperor also; for the image is his form and face. Since then the Son too is the Father's image, it must necessarily be understood that the Godhead and own self of the Father is the Being of the Son. Ed. Ben. iii. § 4—6.

230. And this is the meaning of *Who being in the form of God*, and *the Father in Me*. Nor is this Form of the Godhead partial merely, but the fulness of the Father's Godhead is the Being of the Son, and the Son is whole God. Therefore also, being equal to God, He *thought it not robbery to be equal to God;* and again since the Godhead and the Face of the Son is none other's than the Father's, this is what He says, *I in the Father*. Thus *God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself;* for what belonged to the Substance of the Father is that Son, in whom the creation was then reconciled with God. And thus what things the Son then wrought, are the Father's works, for the Son is the Face of that Father's Godhead, who wrought the works. And thus he who looks at the Son, sees the Father; for in the Father's Godhead is and is contemplated the Son; and the Father's Face, which is in the Son, shows in Him the Father; and thus the Father is in the Son. And that peculiarity and Godhead which is from the Father in the Son, shows the Son in the Father, and His inseparability from Him; and whoso hears and apprehends that what is said of the Father is also said of the Son, not as added to His Substance by grace or participation, but because the very Being of the Son is the own

CH. XXIV. Offspring of the Father's Substance, will fitly understand the words, as I said before, *I in the Father, and the Father in Me;* and *I and the Father are One.* For the Son is such as the Father is, because He has all that is the Father's.

231. Wherefore also is He signified when the Father is named. For, a son not being, we cannot say father; whereas, when we call God a Maker, we do not of necessity manifest the things which through Him have come to be; for a maker is before his works. But when we call God Father, at once with the Father we signify the Son's existence. Therefore also he who believes in the Son, believes also in the Father; for he believes in what belongs to the Father's Substance; and thus the faith is one in One God. And he who worships and honours the Son, in the Son worships and honours the Father; for one is the Godhead; and therefore one the honour and one the worship which is paid to the Father in and through the Son. And he who thus worships, worships one God; for there is one God and none other than He. Accordingly when the Father is called the only God, and we read that there is one God, and *I am*, and *beside Me there is no God*, and *I the first and I am the last*, this has a fit meaning. For God is One and Only and First; but this is not said to the denial of the Son; perish the thought; for He is in that One, and First and Only, as being of that One and Only and First the Only Word and Wisdom and Radiance. And He is Himself the First, too, as being the Fulness of the Godhead of the First and Only, and whole and full God. We maintain then the Divine Unity, not as against the Son, but to deny that there is other such as the Father and His Word.

Chapter XXV.

Answer to objections from Scripture; eighthly, John xvii. 3, *and the like.*

232. Now that this is the sense of the Prophets is clear and manifest to all; but since the impious men, who allege such passages, dishonour the Lord and reproach us, saying, "Behold God is said to be One and Only and First; how say ye that the Son is God? for if He were God, He had not said, *I Alone*, nor *God is One;*" it is necessary to declare the sense of these phrases in addition, as far as our ability allows, that all may know from this also that verily the Arians are God's adversaries. If there then is rivalry of the Son towards the Father, then be such words uttered against Him; and if, according to the apprehensions of David concerning Adonias and Absalom, so too the Father looks upon the Son, then let Him say to Himself and insist on such words, lest He the Son, calling Himself God, make any to revolt from the Father. But if on the contrary, he who knows the Son, knows the Father, the Son Himself revealing Him to him, and in the Word rather he shall see the Father the more, as has been said, and if the Son on coming, glorified not Himself but the Father, saying to one who came to Him, *Why callest thou Me good? none is good save One, that is, God;* and to one who asked, what was the great commandment in the Law, answering, *Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord;* and saying to the multitudes, *I came down from heaven, not to do My own will, but the will of Him that sent Me;* and teaching the disciples, *My Father is greater than I*, and *He that honoureth Me, honoureth Him that sent Me;* if the Son is such towards His own Father, what is the difficulty,[7] that one must need take so perverse a view of such passages? Ed. Ben. iii. § 6–7.

[7] Vid. supr. Disc. nn. 12, 65, 88, 105, &c., vid. App. ὀρθός.

CH. XXV. and on the other hand, if the Son is the Word of the Father, who is so wild, besides these Christ-opposers, as to think that God has thus spoken, as traducing and denying His own Word? This is not the mind of Christians; perish the thought; for not with reference to the Son is it thus written, but for the denial of those falsely called gods, invented by men.

233. And the explanation of such passages is obvious; for since those who are devout to gods falsely so called, revolt from the True God, therefore God, being good and careful for mankind, recalling the wanderers, says, *I am God alone*, and *I am*, and *Besides Me there is no God*, and the like; that He may condemn things which are not, and may convert all men to Himself. And as, supposing in the day-time when the sun was shining, a man were rudely to paint a piece of wood, which had not even the pretence to be luminous, and call that image the source of light, and if the sun with regard to it were to say, "I alone am the light of the day, and there is no other light of the day but I," he would say this, with reference, not to his own radiance, but to the error arising from the wooden image and the dissimilitude of that vain representation; so it is with *I am*, and *I am Only God*, and *There is none other besides Me*, viz., that He may make men renounce falsely called gods, and that they may recognise Him the true God instead.

234. Indeed when God said this, He said it through His own Word, unless forsooth these modern Jews add this too, that He has not said this through His Word; but "the Word of the Lord came" to the Prophet, and this was what was heard; this is what Scriptures declares, let them rave as they will; if the Word be His, of course this was said by the Word, for there is not the thing which God says or does, but He says and does it in the Word. Not then with reference to Him is this said, O God's enemies, but to things foreign to Him and not from Him. For according to the

aforesaid image, if the sun had spoken those words he would have been setting right the error, and have so spoken, not as separating his radiance from him, but in his own radiance showing his own light. Therefore, not for the denial of the Son, nor with reference to Him, are such passages, but to the overthrow of falsehood. Accordingly God spoke not such words to Adam at the beginning, though His Word was with Him, by whom all things came to be; for there was no need, before idols came in; but when men made insurrection against the truth, and named for themselves gods such as they would, then it was that need arose of such words, for the denial of gods that were not. Nay I would add, that they were said even in anticipation of the folly of these Christ-opposers, that they might know, that whatsoever god they devise external to the Father's Substance, he is not True God, nor Image and Son of the Only and First. Ed. Ben. iii. § 7–9.

235. If then the Father be called the only true God, this is said, not to the denial of Him who said, *I am the Truth*, but of those on the other hand who by nature are not true, as the Father and His Word are. And hence the Lord Himself added at once, *and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent*. Now had He been a creature, He would not have added this, and ranked Himself with His Creator; (for what fellowship is there between the True and the not true?) but now by adding Himself to the Father, He has shown that He is of the Father's nature; and He has given us to know that of the True Father He is True Offspring. And John too, as he had learned, so he teaches[8] this, writing in his Epistle, *And we are in the True, even in His Son Jesus Christ; This is the True God and eternal life*. And when the Prophet says concerning the creation, *That stretcheth forth the heavens alone*, and when God says

[8] *μαθὼν ἐδίδαξε*. And so *μαθὼν ἐδίδασκεν*, supr. p. 21, and *ἐρωτῶντες ἐμάνθανον*, supr. p. 250, vid. App. *Tradition*.

CH. XXV. *I only stretch out the heavens*, it is made plain to every one that in the Only is signified also the Word of the Only, in whom *all things were made*, and without whom *was made not one thing*. Therefore, if they were made through the Word, and yet He says, *I only*, and together with that Only is understood the Son, through whom the heavens were made, so also then, if it be said, *One God* and *I Only*, and *I the First*, in that One and Only and First is understood the Word co-existing, as in the Light the Radiance.

236. And this can be held in respect of no other but the Word alone. For all other things subsisted out of nothing through the Son, and are greatly different in nature; but the Son Himself is natural and true Offspring from the Father; and thus, the very passage which these men have thought fit to adduce, *I the First*, in defence of their heresy, doth rather expose their perverse spirit. For God says, *I the First and I the Last;* if then, as if ranked with the things after Him, He is said to be first of them, so that they come next to Him, then certainly you will have shown that He Himself precedes the works in time only; which, to go no further, is a surpassing impiety; but if it is in order to prove that He is not from any, nor any before Him, but that He is Origin and cause of all things, and to destroy the Gentile fables, that He has said *I the First*, it is plain also, that when the Son is called First-born, this is done, not for the sake of ranking Him with the creation, but to prove the framing and adoption of all things through the Son. For as the Father is First, so also is He both First, as Image of the First, and because the First is in Him, and as being Offspring from the Father, in whom the whole creation is created and adopted into sonship.

CHAPTER XXVI.

Answer to objections from Scripture; ninthly, John x. 30; xvii. 11, *&c.*

237. HOWEVER, here too they put forward their private fictions, and contend that the Son and the Father are not in such wise "one," or "like," as the Church preaches, but, as they themselves would have it.[9] For they say, since what the Father wills, the Son wills also, and is not contrary to Him either in what He thinks or in what He judges, but is in all respects concordant with Him, declaring doctrines which are the same, and a message consistent and united with the Father's teaching, therefore it is that He and the Father are One; and some of them have dared to write as well as to say this. Now what can be more extravagant than this? for if this is the reason why the Son and the Father are One, and if in this way the Word is like the Father, it follows forthwith [10] that the Angels too, and the other beings above us, Principalities and Powers and Thrones and Dominions, and things visible, Sun and Moon, and the Stars, should be sons also, as the Son is; and that it should be said of them too, that they and the Father are one, and that each is God's Image and Word. For what God wills, that will they; and neither in judging nor in doctrine are they discordant, but in all things are obedient to their Maker. For they would not have remained in their own glory, unless, what the Father willed, that they had willed also. He, for instance, who did not preserve it, ED. BEN. iii. § 9—10.

[9] *ὡς αὐτοι θέλουσι.* This is a common phrase with Athan., and is here connected with private judgment (*ἴδιον*) in contrast to the Ecclesiastical Tradition; vid. supr. *οὗς ἤθελον*, n. 235, and infr. *ὡς ἡμεῖς θέλομεν*, n. 249. Vid. App. *Tradition.*

[10] *ὥρα εἶναι καί*; vid. also de Syn. § 34, Orat. i. § 15, ii. § 6, iv. § 10, 19, Serap. ii. § 1. Cyr. Dial. p. 456. Thes. p. 255, fin. Euseb. c. Marc. pp. 47, 91. Also *καίρος*, Decr. § 15.

CH. XXVI. but lost his mind, heard the words, *How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!*

238. But if this be so, how is He alone Only-begotten Son and Word and Wisdom? or how, whereas so many are like the Father, is only He an Image? for among men too will be found many like the Almighty Father, numbers, for instance, who became martyrs, and before them the Apostles and Prophets, and again before them the Patriarchs. And many now too have kept the Saviour's command, being merciful, *as their Father who is in heaven*, and observing the exhortation, *Be ye therefore followers of God as dear children, and walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us;* many too have become followers of Paul as he also of Christ. And yet no one of these is Word or Wisdom, or Only-begotten Son or Image; nor has any one of them had the audacity to say, *I and the Father are One*, or, *I in the Father, and the Father in Me;* but it is said of all of them, *Who is like unto Thee among the gods, O Lord? and who shall be likened to the Lord among the sons of God?* and of Him on the contrary that He only is Image true and natural of the Father. For though we were made after the Image, and called both image and glory of God, yet not on our own account is it still, but it is by reason of that Image and true Glory of God inhabiting us, which is His Word, who was for us afterwards made flesh, that we have the grace of this calling.

239. This notion of theirs then being evidently unbefitting and irrational as well as the rest, the likeness and the oneness must be referred to the very Substance of the Son; for unless it be so taken, He will not be shown to have anything beyond things created, as has been said, nor will He be like the Father, but He will merely be like the Father's doctrines; nay, and He differs from the Father, in that the Father is the Father's self, but the doctrines and teaching are beside the Father. If then in respect to the doctrines and the teaching the Son is like the Father,

then the Father according to them will be Father in name only, and the Son will not be an unvarying Image, or rather will be seen to have no claim to be like or to belong to the Father; for what that is like or proper has He who is so utterly different from the Father? for Paul taught like the Saviour, yet was not like Him in substance. Having then such notions, they speak falsely; whereas the Son and the Father are one in such wise as has been said, and in such wise is the Son like the Father Himself and from Him, as we may see and understand a son to be towards his father, and as we may see the radiance towards the sun.[1]

240. Such then being the Son, therefore when the Son works, the Father is the Worker, and when the Son visits the Saints, the Father is He who cometh in the Son, as He has promised when He says, *I and My Father will come, and will make our abode with him;* for in the Image is contemplated the Father, and in the Radiance is the Light. Therefore, as we said just now, when the Father gives grace and peace, the Son also gives it, as Paul signifies in every Epistle, writing, *Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.* For one and the same grace is from the Father in the Son, as the light of the sun and of the radiance is one, and the sun's illumination is effected through the radiance; and so too when he prays for the Thessalonians, in saying, *Now God Himself, even our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ, may He direct our way unto you*, he has guarded the unity of the Father and of the Son. For he has not said, "May they direct," as if a double grace were given from two Sources, This and That, but *May He direct*, to show that the Father gives it through the Son;—at which these impious ones will not blush, though they well might. For if there were

[1] As regards Almighty God, real likeness to Him is identity with Him. This strikes at the Semi-Arians.

CH. XXVI. no unity, nor the Word the proper Offspring of the Father's Substance, as the radiance of the light, but the Son were divided in nature from the Father, it were sufficient that the Father alone should give, since none of created things is a partner with his Maker in His givings; but, as it is, such a mode of giving shows the oneness of the Father and the Son. No one, for instance, would pray to receive from God and the Angels, or from any other creature, nor would any one say, "God and the Angel may He give thee;"[2] but from Father and the Son, because of Their oneness and the oneness of Their giving. For through the Son is given what is given; and there is nothing that the Father does not operate through the Son; for thus is grace secure to him who receives it.

241. And if the Patriarch Jacob, blessing his grandchildren Ephraim and Manasses, said, *God who fed me all my life long unto this day, the Angel that delivered me from all evil, bless the lads*, yet none of created and natural Angels did He join to God their Creator, nor, rejecting God that fed him, did he from any Angel ask the blessing on his grandsons; but in saying, *Who delivered me from all evil*, he showed that it was no created Angel, but the Word of God, whom he joined to the Father in his prayer, through whom, God, whomsoever He will, doth deliver. For knowing that He is also called the Father's *Angel of great Counsel*, he said that none other than He was the Giver of blessing, and Deliverer from evil. Nor was it that he desired a blessing for himself from God, and for his grandchildren from the Angel, but for them too from Him whom he himself had

[2] This seems to show that in Athanasius's day such joint invocations of God and His servants were not in use in the Alexandrian Church. But that the question was one of discipline, not of what was lawful, seems clear from such passages in Scripture as, "they worshipped the Lord and the King," "the people believed the Lord and His servant Moses." As to the point of Christian dogma, Catholics now are as earnest as Athanasius could be, in holding that no temporal or spiritual gift simply comes from creatures.

besought saying, *I will not let Thee go except Thou bless me*, (for that was God, as he says himself, *I have seen God face to face*,) for Him it was that he addressed for a blessing on the sons of Joseph also. Ed. Ben. iii. § 12–13.

242. It belongs then to an Angel to minister at the command of God, and often does he go forth to cast out the Amorite, and is sent to guard the people in the way; but these are not his doings, but God's, who commanded and sent him, whose also it is to deliver whom He will deliver. Therefore it was no other than the Lord God Himself whom he had seen, who said to him, *And behold I am with thee, to guard thee in all the way whither thou goest;* and it was no other than the God whom he had seen, who kept Laban from his treachery, ordering him not to speak evil words to Jacob; and none other than God did he himself beseech, saying, *Rescue me from the hand of my brother Esau, for I fear him;* for in conversation too with his wives he said, *God hath not suffered Laban to injure me.* Therefore it was none other than God Himself that David too besought concerning his deliverance, *When I was in trouble, I called upon the Lord, and He heard me; deliver my soul, O Lord, from lying lips and from a deceitful tongue.* To Him also giving thanks, he spoke the words of the Song in the seventeenth Psalm, in the day in which the Lord delivered him from the hand of all his enemies and from the hand of Saul, saying, *I will love Thee, O Lord my strength; the Lord is my strong rock and my defence and deliverer.* And Paul, after enduring many persecutions, to none other than God gave thanks, saying, *Out of them all the Lord delivered me; and He will deliver, in whom we trust.* And none other than God blessed Abraham and Isaac; and Isaac praying for Jacob, said, *May God bless thee and increase thee and multiply thee, and thou shalt be for many companies of nations, and may He give thee the blessing of Abraham my father.*

CH. XXVI.

243. But if it belong to none other than God to bless and to deliver, and none other was the deliverer of Jacob than the Lord Himself, and if Him the Patriarch besought for his grandsons, Him who had delivered him, evidently none other did he join to God in his prayer, than God's Word, whom therefore he called Angel, because it is He alone who reveals the Father. Which the Apostle also did when he said, *Grace unto you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ*; for thus the blessing was secure, because of the Son's indivisibility from the Father, and because the grace given by Them is one and the same. For though the Father gives it, through the Son is the gift; and though the Son be said to vouchsafe it, it is the Father who supplies it through and in the Son; for *I thank my God*, says the Apostle writing to the Corinthians, *always on your behalf, for the grace of God which is given you in Christ Jesus*. And this we may see in the instance of light and radiance; for what the light enlightens, that the radiance irradiates; and when the radiance irradiates, from the light is its enlightenment. So also when the Son is beheld, so is the Father, for He is the Father's radiance; and thus the Father and the Son are one.

244. But this is not so with things which have been brought into being and are creatures; for when the Father works, it is not that any Angel works, or any other creature; for none of these is an efficient cause, but they are of things which come to be; and moreover being separate and divided from the only God, and other than He in nature, and being mere works, they can neither work what God works, nor, as I said before, when God gives grace, can they give grace with Him. Nor, on seeing an Angel, would a man say that he had seen the Father; for Angels, as it is written, are *ministering spirits sent forth to serve*, and are heralds of gifts given from Him through the Word to their recipients. And the Angel on his appearance himself confesses that

he has been sent by his Lord, as Gabriel confessed in the case of Zacharias, and also in the case of Mary, Mother of God. And he who beholds a vision of Angels, knows that he has seen the Angel and not God. For Zacharias saw an Angel; but Esaias saw the Lord. Manoe, the father of Samson, saw an Angel, but Moses beheld God. Gideon saw an Angel, but to Abraham appeared God. And neither he who saw God beheld an Angel, nor he who saw an Angel considered that he saw God; for greatly, or rather wholly, do things of created nature differ from God the Creator. But if at any time, when the Angel was seen, he who saw it heard God's voice, as took place at the bush; for *the Angel of the Lord was seen in a flame of fire out of the bush, and the Lord called Moses out of the bush, saying, I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob*, still the Angel was not the God of Abraham, but in the Angel God spoke. And what was seen was an Angel; but God spoke in him. For as He spoke to Moses in the pillar of a cloud in the tabernacle, so also God appears and speaks in Angels. So again to the son of Nave He spake by an Angel. But what God speaks, it is very plain He speaks through the Word, and not through another. And the Word, as being not separate from the Father, nor unlike and foreign to the Father's Substance, what He works, those are the Father's works, and His framing of all things is one with His; and what the Son gives, that is the Father's gift. And he who hath seen the Son, knows that in seeing Him, he has seen, not Angel, nor one merely greater than Angels, nor in short any creature, but the Father Himself. And He who hears the Word, knows that he hears the Father; as he who is irradiated by the radiance, knows that he is enlightened by the sun.

ED. BEN. iii. § 13—14.

245. For divine Scripture wishing us thus to understand the matter, has given us such illustrations, as we have

CH. XXVI. said above, from which we are able both to press the traitorous Jews, and to refute the allegation of Gentiles who maintain and think, on account of the Triad, that we profess many Gods. For, as the illustration shows, we do not introduce three Origins or three Fathers, as the followers of Marcion and Manichæus; since we have not suggested the image of three suns, but sun and radiance. And one only is the light from the sun in the radiance; and so we know of but one origin; and the All-framing Word we hold to have no other manner of godhead than that of the Only God, because He is born from Him. Rather then will the Ario-maniacs with reason incur the charge of polytheism or else of atheism, because they idly talk of the Son as external and a creature, and again of the Spirit as from nothing. For either they will say that the Word is not God; or, saying that He is God, because it is so written, but not proper to the Father's Substance, they will be introducing many Words, as admitting in God a difference of kind;—(unless forsooth they shall dare to say that by participation only, He, as all things else, is called God; though, if this be their sentiment, their impiety is the same, as considering the Word as one among all things)—but may this never even come into our minds! For there is but one Face[3] of Godhead, which is also in the Word; and one God, the Father, existing of Himself according as He is above all, and appearing in the Son according as He pervades all things, and in the Spirit according as in Him He acts in all things through the Word. For thus we confess God to be one through the Trinity, and we say that our belief in the one Godhead in the Trinity is a much more religious conception than the godhead which the heretics acknowledge with its many forms and its many parts.

246. For if it be not so, but the Word is a creature and a work out of nothing, either He is not True God, because

[3] εἶδος, character, features.

He is Himself one of the creatures, or if they name Him God from regard for the Scriptures, they must of necessity say that there are two Gods, one Creator, the other creature, and must serve two Lords, one Ingenerate, and the other generate and a creature; and must have two faiths, one in the True God, and the other in one who is made and fashioned by themselves and called God. And it follows of necessity, in so great blindness, that, when they worship the Ingenerate, they renounce the generate, and when they come to the creature, they turn from the Creator. For they cannot see the One in the Other, because Their natures and operations are to them foreign and distinct from each other. And with such sentiments, they will certainly be going on to more gods, for this is the proceeding of those who have revolted from the One God. Wherefore then, when the Arians have these speculations and views, do they not rank themselves with the Gentiles? for they too, as these, worship the creature more than God the Creator of all; and though they shrink from the Gentile name, in order to deceive the unskilful, yet they secretly hold a like sentiment with them. ED. BEN. iii. § 15—16.

247. Their subtle saying which they are accustomed to urge, "We say not two Ingenerates," they plainly employ to deceive the simple; for in their very professing "We say not two Ingenerates," they imply two Gods, and these with different natures, one generate and one Ingenerate. And though the Greeks worship one Ingenerate and many generate gods, while Arians one Ingenerate and one generate, this is no difference between them; for the God whom these men call generate is one out of many; and again, the many gods of the Greeks have the same nature with this one, for both he and they are creatures. Wretched then are they and greater traitors than the Jews in their denial of the Christ, and they wallow with the Gentiles, being hateful to God, as worshipping the creature and many deities.

CH. XXVI. 248. For there is One God, and not many, and ——— One is His Word, and not many; for the Word is God, and He alone has the Face of the Father. Being then such, the Saviour Himself urged the Jews with these words, *The Father Himself who hath sent Me, hath borne witness of Me; ye have neither heard His voice at any time nor seen His Face; and ye have not His Word abiding in you; for whom He hath sent, Him ye believe not.* Suitably has He joined the *Word* to the *Face*, to show that the Word of God is Himself Image and Impress and Face of His Father; and that the Jews who did not receive Him who spoke to them, thereby did not receive the Word, which is the Face of God. This too it was that the Patriarch Jacob having seen, received a blessing from Him and the name of Israel instead of Jacob, as divine Scripture witnesses, saying, *And as the Face of God passed by, the sun rose upon him.* And This it was who said, *He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father*, and, *I in the Father and the Father in Me*, and, *I and the Father are one;* for thus God is One, and one the faith in the Father and Son; for, though the Word be God, the Lord our God is one Lord; for the Son belongs to that One, and is inseparably His according to what is proper and peculiar to His Substance.

249. The Arians, however, reply, "Not as you say, but as we will; and we will thus:—So are the Son and the Father One, and so is the Father in the Son and the Son in the Father, as we too may become one in Him. For this is written in the Gospel according to John, and Christ desired it for us in these words, *Holy Father, keep through Thine own Name those whom Thou hast given Me, that they may be one, as We are.* And shortly after: *Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on Me through their word; that they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me. And the*

glory which Thou gavest Me I have given them, ED. BEN. iii. § 16—17.
that they may be one, even as We are one; I in ———
them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one, and that the world may know that Thou hast sent Me." Then, as having found an evasion, these men of craft[4] add, "If, as we become one in the Father, so also He and the Father are one, and thus He too is in the Father, how pretend you from His saying, *I and the Father are One*, and *I in the Father and the Father in Me*, that He is proper and like the Father's Substance? for it follows either that we too are proper to the Father's Substance, or He foreign to it, as we are foreign."

250. What is this but saying after the pattern of the evil one, "We will ascend to heaven, we will be like the Most High." For what is given to man by grace, this they would make equal to the Godhead of the Giver. Thus hearing that men are called sons, they thought themselves equal to the True Son who is by nature such. And now again hearing from the Saviour, *that they may be one as We are*, they deceive themselves, and are arrogant enough to think that they may be such as the Son is in the Father and the Father in the Son; not considering the fall of their *father the devil*, which happened upon such an imagination. If then, as we have many times said, the Word of God is the same with us, and nothing differs from us except in time, let Him be like us, and have the same place with the Father as we have; nor let Him be called Only-begotten, nor only Word or Wisdom of the Father; but let the same name be of common

[4] οἱ δόλιοι. And so οἱ θεοστυγεῖς, supr. § 16; οἱ κακόφρονες, infr. § 26; οἱ δειλαιοι, ibid.; οἱ παράφρονες, de Decr. § 8, a.; οἱ ἄθλιοι, Orat. ii. § 39 fin.; οἱ δυσσεβεῖς, in illud Omn. 3 fin.; οἱ θαυμαστοί, Ep. Æg. 14, c. 16 init.; οἱ πανοῦργοι, Ep. Æg. 16. c.; οἱ παράνομοι, Ep. Æg. 16, d.; οἱ ἄτιμοι, Serap. i. 15, f.; οἱ ἀνόητοι, Orat. ii. § 11, c.; οἱ μηδὲν ἀληθεύοντες, Hist. Ar. 7, b.; οἱ ἀπάνθρωποι καὶ μισόκαλοι, ibid. e.; οἱ ὕποπτοι, ibid. 9, d.; οἱ τολμηροί, ibid. 20, e.; οἱ ἄφρονες, ibid. 47, d., &c., &c.

CH. XXVI. application to all us who are like Him. For it is right that they who have one nature should have their name in common, though they differ from each other in point of time. For Adam was a man, and Paul a man, and he who has come into being at this day is a man, and time is not that condition which alters the nature of the race. If then the Word also differs from us only in time, then we must be as He. But in truth neither we are Word or Wisdom, nor is He creature or work; else why are we all sprung from one, and He the Only Word? but though it be suitable to them thus to speak, in us at least it is unsuitable to entertain their blasphemies. And yet, needless though it be to refine[5] upon these passages, considering their so clear and religious sense, and our own orthodox belief, yet that their irreligion may be shown here also, come let us shortly, as we have received from the fathers, expose their heterodoxy from the passage in question.

251. It is a custom with divine Scripture to take the things of nature as images and illustrations for mankind; and this it does, that from these physical objects the moral impulses of man may be explained; and thus their conduct shown to be either bad or righteous. For instance, in the case of the bad, as when it charges, *Be ye not like to horse and mule which have no understanding.* Or as when it says, complaining of those who have become such, *Man, being in honour hath no understanding, but is compared unto the beasts that perish.* And again, *They were as fed horses in the morning.* And the Saviour to expose Herod said, *Tell that fox:* but, on the other hand, charged His disciples, *Behold I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves; be ye therefore wise as serpents and innocent*

[5] περιεργάζεσθαι, vid. Orat. ii. § 34, § 73. fin. iii. § 1. § 43, init. iv. § 33 init. Serap. i. 15 fin. 17, d. 18, e. περίεργα in Acts xix. 19, is generally interpreted of magic, though it is otherwise explained as embracing various kinds of bad books in Ortlob. Dissert. ap. Thesaur. Nov. Theol.-Phil. in N. T. t. 2.

as doves. And He said this, not that we may become in nature beasts of burden, or become serpents and doves; for He hath not so made us Himself, and therefore nature does not allow of it; but that we might eschew the irrational motions of the one, and being aware of the wisdom of that other animal, might not be deceived by it, and might take on us the meekness of the dove. Again, taking patterns for man from divine subjects, the Saviour says, *Be ye merciful, as your Father who is in heaven is merciful;* and, *Be ye perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.* And He said this too, not that we might become such as the Father; for to become as the Father is impossible for us creatures, who have been brought into being out of nothing; but as He charged us, *Be ye not like to horse*, not lest we should become as draught animals, but that we ought not to imitate their want of reason; so not that we might become as God, did He say, *Be ye merciful as your Father*, but that, looking at His beneficent acts, what we do well, we might do not for men's sake, but for His sake, so that from Him and not from men we may have the reward. For as, although there be one Son by nature, True and Only-begotten, we too become sons, not as He in nature and truth, but according to the grace of Him that calleth; and though we are men from the earth, we are yet called gods, not as the True God or His Word, but as has pleased God who has given us that grace; so also, as God do we become merciful, not by being made equal to God, nor becoming in nature and truth benefactors, (for it is not our gift to benefit, but it belongs to God,) but in order that what has come to us from God Himself by grace, these things we may impart to others without making distinctions, but largely towards all extending our kind service. For only then and in this way can we anyhow become imitators, and in no other, when we minister to others what comes from Him.

Ed. Ben. iii. § 18—19.

CH. XXVI. 252. And as we put a fair and orthodox sense upon these texts, such again is the sense of the passage in John. For He does not say, that as the Son is in the Father, such we must become:—whence could it be? when He is God's Word and Wisdom, and we were fashioned out of the earth, and He is by nature and substance Word and true God,—for thus speaks John, *We know that the Son of God is come, and He hath given us an understanding to know Him that is True, and we are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ; this is the true God and eternal life.* And we are made sons through Him by adoption and grace, as partaking of His Spirit, (for *as many as received Him*, he says, *to them gave He power to become children of God, even to them that believe on His Name*,) and therefore also He is the Truth, (saying, *I am the Truth*, and in His address to His Father, He said *Sanctify them through Thy Truth, Thy Word is Truth*;) but we by imitation become virtuous and sons:—therefore, not that we may become such as He, did He say, *that they may be one as We are*; but that as He, being the Word, is in His own Father, so we too, taking Him as an exemplar and looking at Him, might become one towards each other in unanimity and oneness of spirit, nor be at variance as the Corinthians, but breathe the same sentiments as those five thousand in the Acts, who were as one. For it is as *sons*, not as the Son; as *gods*, not as He Himself, and *merciful as the Father*, but still not as the Father. And, as has been said, by so becoming one, as the Father and the Son, we shall be such, not as the Father is by nature in the Son and the Son in the Father, but according to our own nature, and as it is possible for us from that nature to be moulded and to learn how we ought to be one, just as we learned also to be merciful. For like things are naturally one with like; thus all flesh is ranked together in kind; but the Word is unlike us and like the Father. And

therefore while He is in nature and truth one with His own Father, we, as being of one kind with each other, (for from one were all made, and one is the nature of all men,) become one with each other in good disposition, having as our copy the Son's natural unity with the Father. For as He taught us meekness from Himself, saying, *Learn of Me, for I am meek and lowly in heart*, not that we may become equal to Him, which is impossible, but that looking towards Him, we may remain meek continually, so also here, wishing that our good disposition[6] towards each other should be true and firm and indissoluble, from Himself taking the pattern, He says, *that they may be one, as We are* whose oneness is indivisible; that is, that "they learning from Us what is Our indivisible Nature, may preserve in like manner agreement one with another." And this imitation of things which are in nature is especially safe for man, as has been said; for since they remain and never change, whereas the conduct of men is very changeable, one may look to what is unchangeable by nature, and avoid what is bad, and re-model themselves on what is best. Ed. Ben. iii. § 19—21.

253. And for this reason also the words *that they may be one in Us*, have a right sense: "in Us" means "after our pattern." If, for instance, it were possible for us to become as the Son in the Father, the words ought to run, "that they may be one in Thee," as the Son is in the Father; but, as it is, He has not said this; but by saying *in Us* He has pointed out the distance and difference; that He indeed is Only in the Only Father, as Only Word and Wisdom; but we in the Son, and through Him in the Father. And thus speaking, He meant this Only, "By Our unity may they also be so one with each other, as We

[6] διαθέσει, disposition; this is its sense in Decr. § 2 fin. Orat. ii. § 4, iii. § 20. Monach. init. Hist. Arian. § 45. Hipp. c. Noet. 7, Theod. Hist. i. 4 (5), init. Parker strangely translates in ii § 4, "external condition."

CH. XXVI. are one in nature and truth; for otherwise they could not be one, except by learning unity in Us." And that *in Us* has this signification we may learn from Paul, who says, *These things I have in a figure transferred to myself and to Apollos, that ye may learn in us not to be puffed up above that is written.* The words *in Us*, then, are not "in the Father," as the Son is in Him; but imply an example and image, instead of saying, "Let them learn of Us." For as Paul to the Corinthians, so is the oneness of the Son and the Father a pattern and lesson to all, by which they may learn, looking to that natural unity of the Father and the Son, how they themselves ought to be one in spirit towards each other. Or if it needs to account for the phrase otherwise, the words *in Us* may mean the same as saying, that in the power of the Father and the Son they may be one, speaking the same things; for without God this is impossible. And this mode of speech also we may find in the divine writings, as *In God will we do great acts;* and *In Thee will we tread down our enemies.* Therefore it is plain, that in the Name of Father and Son we shall be able, becoming one, to hold firm the bond of charity.

254. For, dwelling still on the same thought, the Lord says, *And the glory which Thou gavest Me I have given to them, that they may be one as We are one.* Suitably has He here too said, not, "That they may be in Thee as I am," for that would have been to make Him one of them, and to make them one with the Father, but *as We are;* but as to the word *as*, it signifies not identity with, but an image and example of the things spoken of. The Word then has the real and true identity of nature with the Father; but to us it is given to imitate it, as has been said; for He immediately adds, *I in them and Thou in Me; that they may be made perfect in one.* Here at length the Lord asks something greater and more perfect for us; for it is plain

that it is in us that the Word has come to be, for He has put on our body. *And Thou Father in Me;* "for I am Thy Word, and since Thou art in Me, because I am Thy Word, and since I am in them by reason of the body, and since by reason of Thee the salvation of men is perfected in Me, therefore I ask that they also may become one, according to the body that is in Me and according to its perfection; that they too may become perfect, having oneness with It, and having become all one in It; that, as if all were carried by Me, all may be one body and one spirit, and may grow up unto a perfect man." For we all, partaking of the Same, become one body, having the one Lord in ourselves. Since the passage then has this meaning, still more plainly is refuted the heterodoxy of Christ's enemies. I repeat it: if He had said simply and absolutely "that they may be one in Thee," or "that they and I may be one in Thee," God's enemies had had some plea, though an extravagant; but in fact He has not spoken simply, but, *As Thou, Father, in Me, and I in Thee, that they may be all one.* Ed. Ben. iii. § 21—23.

255. Moreover, by using the word *as*, He marks that He is speaking of those who only distantly become what He is in the Father; distantly not in place but in nature; for in place nothing is far from God, in nature alone all things are far from Him. And, as I said before, whoso uses the particle *as* implies, not identity nor equality with, but a copy of the matter in question, when viewed in a certain respect. Indeed we may learn also from our Saviour Himself, when He says, *For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.* For Jonas was not as the Saviour, nor did Jonas go down to Hades; nor was the whale Hades; nor did Jonas, when swallowed up, bring up those who had before been swallowed by the whale, but he alone came forth, when

CH. XXVI. the whale was bidden. Therefore there is no identity nor equality signified in the term *as*, but one thing and another; and there is a certain kind of parallel to our Lord in the case of Jonas, on account of the three days. In like manner then we too, when the Lord says *as*, neither become as the Son is in the Father, nor as the Father is in the Son. For we become one as the Father and the Son in mind and agreement of spirit, and the Saviour will be as Jonas buried in the earth; but as the Saviour is not Jonas, nor, as he, was swallowed up, so did the Saviour descend into Hades, but it is only a parallel; in like manner, if we too become one, as the Son in the Father, we shall not be as the Son nor equal to Him; for He and we are but parallels. For on this account is the word *as* applied to us; since things differing from others in nature become as they when viewed in a certain relation.

256. Wherefore the Son Himself, simply and without any condition, is in the Father; for this attribute He has by nature; but for us, to whom it is not natural, there is needed a pattern and example, that He may say of us, *As Thou in Me, and I in Thee.* "And when they shall be so perfected," He says, "then the world knows that Thou hast sent Me, for unless I had come and borne this their body, no one of them had been perfected, but one and all had remained corruptible. Work Thou then in them, O Father; and as Thou hast given to Me to bear this body, grant to them Thy Spirit, that they too in It may become one, and may be perfected in Me. For their perfecting shows that Thy Word has sojourned among them; and the world seeing them perfect and full of God, will believe altogether that Thou hast sent Me, and I have sojourned here. For whence is this their perfecting, but that I, Thy Word, having borne their body, and become man, have perfected the work which Thou gavest Me, O Father? And the work is perfected, because men, redeemed from sin, no longer

remain dead; but being made gods, have in each other, by looking at Me, the bond of charity." Ed. Ben. iii. § 23—24.

257. We then, by way of giving a rude view of the language used in this passage, have been led into many words; but blessed John in his Epistle will show the sense of the words, concisely and much more perfectly than we can. And he will both disprove the interpretation of these impious men, and will teach how we come to be in God and God in us, and how again in Him we become One, and how utterly the Son differs in nature from us; and he will thereby rid the Arians of their imagination that they shall be as the Son, lest they hear it said to them, *Thou art a man and not God*, and, *Stretch not thyself, being poor, beside the rich.* John then thus writes: *Hereby know we that we dwell in Him and He in us, because He hath given us of His Spirit.* Therefore, because of the grace of the Spirit which has been given to us, in Him we come to be, and He in us; and since it is the Spirit of God, therefore through His becoming in us, reasonably are we, as having the Spirit, considered to be in God, and thus is God in us. Not then as the Son in the Father, so also we come to be in the Father; for the Son of God does not merely partake the Spirit, in order to His being in the Father; nor again does He receive the Spirit at all, but rather He supplies It Himself to all; and the Spirit does not unite the Word to the Father, but rather the Spirit receives from the Word. And the Son is in the Father, as His proper Word and Radiance; but we, apart from the Spirit, are foreign and distant from God, and by the participation of the Spirit we are knit into the Godhead; so that our being in the Father is not ours by nature, but is the Spirit's gift who is in us and abides in us, while by confession of the faith we preserve It in us, John again saying, *Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him and he in God.*

CH. XXVI.

258. What then is our likeness and equality to the Son? rather, are not the Arians confuted on every side? and especially by John, from whom we learn that the Son is in the Father in one way, and we become in Him in another, and that neither we shall ever be as He, nor is the Word as we; unless indeed they boldly persist in saying still, that the Son also by participation of the Spirit and by ethical improvement [7] came to be in the Father. But here again there is an excess of impiety, even in admitting the thought. For He, as has been said, gives to the Spirit, and whatever the Spirit hath, He hath from the Word. The Saviour, then, saying of us, *As Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they too may be one in Us*, does not signify that we were to have identity with Him, as was shown from the instance of Jonas; but it is a claim upon the Father, as John has written, that the Spirit should be vouchsafed through Him to those who believe, through whom we are found to be in God, and in this respect to be united in Him. For since the Word is in the Father, and the Spirit is given from the Word, He wills that we should receive the Spirit, in order that, when we receive It, then, having the Spirit of the Word who is in the Father, we too may be found, by reason of the Spirit, One in the Word, and through Him with the Father.

259. And if He says, *as we*, this again is only a request that such grace of the Spirit as is given to the disciples may be without failure or revocation. For what the Word has in the way of nature, as I said, in the Father, that He wishes to be given to us through the Spirit irrevocably; which the Apostle knowing, said, *Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?* for *the gifts of God* and *grace of*

[7] *βελτιώσει πράξεως*, and so ad Afros, *τρόπων βελτίωσις*, 8. Vid. also Orat. i. §§ 37, 43, 47, &c. (supr. pp. 215 init., 222 fin. 227, &c.)

His calling are without repentance. It is the Spirit then which is in God, and not we viewed in our own selves; and as we are sons and gods because of the Word in us, so we shall be in the Son and in the Father, and we shall be accounted to have become one in Son and in Father, inasmuch as that Spirit is in us which is in the Word who is in the Father. When then a man falls from the Spirit for any wickedness, if he repent after his fall, the grace remains irrevocably to such souls as have the will; but he who has fallen is no longer in God, (because that Holy Spirit and Paraclete which is in God has deserted him,) and shall henceforth be in him to whom he has subjected himself, as took place in Saul's instance; for the Spirit of God departed from him and an evil spirit afflicted him. God's enemies hearing this ought to be thereupon abashed, and no longer to feign themselves equal to God. But they neither understand (for *the irreligious*, he saith, *does not understand knowledge*) nor endure religious words, but find them heavy even to hear. Ed. Ben. iii. § 24–26.

Chapter XXVII.

Answer to objections from Scripture; Introductory to Texts from the Gospels on the Incarnation.

260. For behold, as if not wearied out in their impieties, but with hardened Pharaoh, while they hear and see the Saviour's human attributes in the Gospels, they have utterly forgotten, like the Samosatene, the Son's paternal Godhead, and with arrogant and audacious tongue they say, "How can the Son be from the Father by nature, and be like Him in substance, who says, *All power is given unto Me;* and *The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son;* and *The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into His hand; he that believeth in the Son hath everlasting life;* and again, *All things are delivered unto Me*

CH. XXVII. *of My Father, and no one knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him;* and again, *All that the Father hath given unto Me shall come to Me.*" On this they observe, "If, as ye say, He was Son by nature, He had no need to receive aught, but He had it by nature as a Son."

261. "Or how can He be the natural and true Power of the Father, who near upon the season of the passion says, *Now is My soul troubled, and what shall I say? Father, save Me from this hour; but for this came I unto this hour. Father, glorify Thy Name. Then came there a voice from heaven, saying, I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again.* And He said the same another time: *Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from Me;* and *when Jesus had thus said, He was troubled in spirit, and testified and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray Me.*" Then these perverse men argue: "If He were Power, He had not feared, but rather He had supplied power to others."

262. Further they say: "If He were by nature the true and proper Wisdom of the Father, how is it written, *And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man?* In like manner, when He had come into the parts of Cæsarea Philippi, He asked the disciples whom men said that He was; and when He came to Bethany He asked where Lazarus lay; and He said besides to His disciples, *How many loaves have ye?* How then," say they, "is He Wisdom, who increased in wisdom, and who was evidently ignorant of that which He asked of others?"

263. This too they urge: "How can He be the proper Word of the Father, without whom the Father never was, by whom He makes all things, as ye think, whereas He said upon the Cross, *My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?* and He had before that prayed, *Glorify Thy Name,*

and, *O Father, glorify Thou Me with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was.* And He used to pray in the deserts, and charge His disciples to pray lest they should enter into temptation; and, *The spirit indeed is willing*, He said, *but the flesh is weak.* And, *Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, nor the Angels, neither the Son.*" Upon this again they say, "If the Son were, according to your interpretation, eternally existent with God, He had not been ignorant of the Day, but had known it as being Word; nor had He been forsaken as being co-existent; nor had asked to receive glory, as having it in the Father; nor would have prayed at all, for, being the Word, He had needed nothing; but since He is a creature and one of things which were brought into being, therefore He thus spoke, and needed what He had not; for it belongs to creatures to require and to have needs." ED. BEN. iii. § 26—27.

264. This then is what these men allege in their discourses; and if they thus argue, it would be only consistent in them to speak yet more daringly: "Why in the first instance did the Word become flesh?" and they might add, "For how could He, being God, become man?" or, "How could the Immaterial bear a body?" or they might speak with Caiaphas still more Judaically, "Why in short did Christ, being a mere man, make Himself God?" for this doctrine and the like the Jews carped at when they saw Him, and the Arians repudiate when they read of Him, and have fallen away into blasphemies. If then a man should carefully parallel the words of these and those, he will of a certainty find them both arriving at the same infidelity, and the daring of their impiety equal, and their quarrel with us a joint one.[8] For the Jews said, "How, being a man, can He be God?" And the Arians, "If He were very God from God, how could He become man?"

[8] This parallel between the Arians and the Jews is also drawn out by Athan. in Decr. § 1 and 2 (supr. pp. 12, 13).

CH. XXVII. And the Jews were offended then and mocked, saying, "Had He been Son of God, He had not endured the Cross;" and the Arians, taking their stand over against them, urge upon us, "How dare ye say that He is the Word proper to the Father's Substance, who had a body, so as to be capable of enduring all this?" Next, while the Jews sought to kill the Lord, because He said that God was His own Father, and made Himself equal to Him, as working what the Father works, the Arians also, not only have learned to deny both that He is equal to God, and that God is the proper and natural Father of the Word, but those who hold this they seek to kill. Again, whereas the Jews said, "*Is not this the Son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? how then is it that He saith, Before Abraham was, I am*, and *I came down from heaven?*" the Arians on the other hand make response[9] and say conformably, "How can He be Word or God, who slept as man, and wept, and inquired?" Thus both parties deny the Eternity and Godhead of the Word in consequence of those human attributes which the Saviour took on Him by reason of that flesh which He bore.

265. Extravagance then like this being Judaic, and Judaic after the mind of Judas the traitor, let them openly confess themselves scholars of Caiaphas and Herod, instead

Hence his phrase οἱ νῦν Ἰουδαῖοι for Arians (in spite of his sometimes using it for the Jews of his day, e.g. Orat. i. §§ 8, 10, 38, ii. 1, &c.), e.g. Ἰουδαῖοι οἵ τε παλαιοὶ καὶ οἱ νέοι οὗτοι, Orat. iii. § 52. τῶν νῦν Ἰουδαίων, in illud Omnia, § 5. οἱ τότε καὶ οἱ νέοι νῦν, Sent. D. 3, τῶν νέων Ἰουδαίων, ibid. 4, init. (vid. also καὶ οἱ τότε Ἰουδαῖοι, i. Orat. § 8, yet vid. οἱ τότε Ἰουδαῖοι, de Syn. § 33.) τῶν νῦν Ἰουδαϊζόντων, Orat. i. § 39. ἡ Ἰουδαϊκὴ νέα αἵρεσις, Hist. Arian. 19 fin. Ἰουδαῖοι οἱ τότε . . . . Ἀρειανοὶ νῦν Ἰουδαΐζοντες, Decr. § 2. The Arians are addressed under the name of Jews, ὦ χριστόμαχοι καὶ ἀχάριστοι Ἰουδαῖοι, Orat. iii. § 55. They are said to be Jews *passim*. It is observable, that Eusebius makes a point, on the contrary, of calling Marcellus a Judaiser and Jewish, on the ground that he denied that Wisdom was more than an attribute in the Divine Mind, e.g. pp. 42, c. 62, fin. 65, d.

[9] ἐπακούουσιν. Montfaucon in Onomast. (Athan. Opp. t. 2, ad calc.) adduces other passages in his author, where ἐπακούειν, like ὑπακούειν, means to answer, vid. Apolog. contr. Arian. § 88, Apol. ad Const. § 16, init.

of cloaking Judaism with the name of Christianity, and let them deny outright, as we said before, the Saviour's presence in the flesh, for a disbelief of this sort is akin to their heresy; or if they fear openly to Judaise and be circumcised,[1] from servility towards Constantius and for their sake whom they have beguiled, then let them keep from saying what the Jews say; for if they disown the name, let them in fairness renounce the doctrine. For we are Christians, O Arians, Christians we; it is our privilege well to know the Gospels concerning the Saviour, and neither with Jews to stone Him, if we hear of His Godhead and Eternity, nor with you to stumble at such lowly sayings as He may speak for our sakes as man. If then you would become Christians, put off Arius's madness and cleanse with the words of religion those ears of yours which blaspheming has defiled; knowing that, by ceasing to be Arians, you will cease also from the malevolence of the present Jews. Then at once will truth shine on you out of darkness, and ye will no longer reproach us with holding two Eternals, but ye will with us acknowledge that the Lord is God's true Son by nature, and not as simply eternal in Himself, but revealed as co-existing in the Father's eternity. He is more than eternal; He is co-eternal. For there are things called eternal of which He is Framer; thus in the twenty-third Psalm it is written, *Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors;* and it is plain that through Him these things were made; but if even of things everlasting He is the Framer, who of us shall be able henceforth to dispute that He is anterior to those things eternal, and in consequence is proved to be Lord not so much from His eternity, as in that He is God's Son; for being the Son, He is inseparable from the Father, and never was it when He existed not, but He was always;

ED. BEN. iii. § 27—28.

[1] And so supr. p. 216.

CH. XXVII. and being the Father's Image and Radiance, He has the Father's eternity also.

266. Now that they certainly give an unsound interpretation of these passages from the Gospels we may easily see, if we take into account the scope of that faith which we Christians hold, and apply it as our rule, as the Apostle teaches in our reading of inspired Scripture.[2] For Christ's enemies, being ignorant of this drift, have wandered from the way of truth, and have stumbled on a stone of stumbling, thinking otherwise than they should think. Now the scope and form of Scripture teaching, as we have often said, is this,—it contains a double announcement of the Saviour; that He was ever God, and is the Son, being the Father's Word and Radiance and Wisdom; and that afterwards for us He took flesh of a Virgin, of Mary, Mother of God, and was made man. And this scope is to be found traced throughout inspired Scripture, as the Lord Himself has said, *Search the Scriptures, for they are they which testify of Me.* But lest I should exceed in writing, by bringing together all the passages on the subject, let it suffice to mention as a specimen, first John saying, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him, and without Him was made not one thing;* next, *And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the Only-begotten of the Father;* and next Paul writing, *Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion like a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross.* Any one beginning with these

[2] Vid. Append. *Regula Fidei;* also supr. pp. 163, 214, infr. 399, 407 note, 427, &c.

passages and going through the whole of Scripture, upon the interpretation which they suggest, will perceive how in the beginning the Father said to Him, *Let there be light*, and *Let there be a firmament*, and *Let us make man;* and how in fulness of the ages, He sent Him into the world, not that He might judge the world, but that the world by Him might be saved, and how accordingly it is written, *Behold a Virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a Son, and they shall call His Name Emmanuel, which, being interpreted, is God with us.* The reader then of divine Scripture may acquaint himself with those passages from the older books; and from the Gospels on the other hand he will perceive that the Lord became man; for *the Word*, he says, *became flesh and dwelt among us.* ED. BEN. iii. § 28—30.

267. And He became man, and did not come into man; for this it is necessary to know, lest perchance these men fall into this notion also, and beguile any into thinking, that, as in former times the Word was used to come into each of the saints, so now He sojourned in a man, hallowing him also, and manifesting himself as in the others. For if it were so, and He only appeared in a man, it were nothing strange, nor had those who saw Him been startled, saying, Whence is He? and wherefore dost Thou, being a man, make Thyself God? for they were familiar with the idea, from the words, *And the Word of the Lord came* to the Prophets one by one. But now, since the Word of God, by whom all things came to be, endured to become also Son of man, and humbled Himself, taking a servant's form, therefore to the Jews the Cross of Christ is a scandal, but to us Christ is *God's power* and *God's wisdom;* for *the Word*, as John says, *became flesh;* (it being the custom of Scripture to call man by the name of *flesh*, as it says by Joel the Prophet, *I will pour out My Spirit upon all flesh;* and as Daniel said to Astyages, *I may not worship idols made with hands, but the Living God, who hath created the*

CH. XXVII. *heaven and the earth, and hath sovereignty over all flesh;* for both he and Joel call mankind flesh.) Of old time He was wont to come to the Saints individually, and to hallow those who truly received Him; but neither, on their birth, was it said that He had become man, nor, when they suffered, was it said that He Himself suffered. But when He came among us from Mary, once for all in fulness of the ages, for the abolition of sin, (for so it was pleasing to the Father to send His own Son, *made of a woman, made under the Law,*) then it is said, that He took flesh and became man, and in that flesh He suffered for us, (as Peter says, *Christ therefore having suffered for us in the flesh,*) that it might be shown, and that we all might believe, that, whereas He was ever God, and hallowed those to whom He came, and ordered all things according to the Father's will, afterwards for our sakes He became man, and *bodily*, as the Apostle says, the Godhead dwelt in the flesh; as much as to say, "Being God, He had His own body, and using this is an instrument,[3] He became man for our sakes."

268. And on account of this, the properties of the flesh are said to be His, since He was in it, such as to hunger, to thirst, to suffer, to weary, and the like, of which the flesh is capable; while on the other hand the works proper to the Word Himself, such as to raise the dead, to restore sight to the blind, and to cure the woman with an issue of blood, He did through His own body, and the Word bore the infirmities of the flesh, as His own, for His was the flesh; and the flesh ministered to the works of the Godhead, because the Godhead was in it, for the body was God's. And well has the Prophet said *carried;* and has not said, "He tended our infirmities," lest, as being external to the body, and only healing it, as He has always done, He should leave men subject still to death; but He *carries* our infirmities, and He Himself bears our

[3] Vid. App. ὄργανον.

sins, that it might be shown that He became man for us, and that the body which in Him bore them was His proper body; and, while He received no hurt Himself by *bearing our sins in His body on the tree*, as Peter speaks, we men were redeemed from our own affections, and were filled with the righteousness of the Word. Whence it was that, when the flesh suffered, the Word was not external to it; and therefore is the passion said to be His; and when He did divinely His Father's works, the flesh was not external to Him, but in the body itself did the Lord do them. Hence, when made man, He said, *If I do not the works of the Father, believe Me not; but if I do, though ye believe not Me, believe the works, that ye may know that the Father is in Me, and I in Him.* Ed. Ben. iii. § 30—32.

269. And thus when there was need to raise Peter's wife's mother who was sick of a fever, He stretched forth His hand humanly, but He stopped the illness divinely. And in the case of the man blind from the birth, human was the spittle which He gave forth from the flesh, but divinely did He open the eyes through the clay. And in the case of Lazarus, He gave forth a human voice, as man; but divinely, as God, did He raise Lazarus from the dead. These things were so done, were so manifested, because He had a body, not in appearance, but in truth; and it beseemed that the Lord, in putting on human flesh, should put it on whole with the affections proper to it; that, as we say that the body was proper to Him, so also we may say that the affections of the body were absolutely proper to Him, though they did not touch Him according to His Godhead. If then the body had been another's, to that other too had been the affections attributed; but if the flesh is the Word's (for *the Word became flesh*,) of necessity then the affections also of the flesh are ascribed to Him, whose the flesh is. And to whom the bodily affections are ascribed, such namely as to be condemned, to be scourged, to thirst,

CH. XXVII. and the cross, and death, and the other infirmities of the body, of Him too is the triumph and the grace. For this cause then, consistently and fittingly such affections are ascribed not to another, but to the Lord; that the grace also may be from Him, and that we may become, not worshippers of any other, but truly devout towards God, because we invoke no creature, no ordinary man, but the natural and true Son from God, who has become man, yet is not the less Lord and God and Saviour.

270. Who will not admire this? or who will not agree that such a thing is truly divine? for if the works of the Word's Godhead had not taken place through the body, man had not been made god; and again, had not the belongings of the flesh been ascribed to the Word, man had not been thoroughly delivered from them; but though they had ceased for a little while, as I said before, still sin had remained in man and corruption, as was the case with mankind before He came; and for this reason:—Many, for instance, have been made holy and clean from all sin; nay, Jeremias was hallowed even from the womb, and John, while yet in the womb, leapt for joy at the voice of Mary Mother of God; nevertheless, *death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression;* and thus men remained mortal and corruptible as before, liable to the affections proper to their nature. But now the Word having become man, and having appropriated the affections of the flesh, no longer do these affections touch the body, because of the Word who has come in it, but they are destroyed by Him, and henceforth men no longer remain sinners and dead according to their proper affections, but having risen according to the Word's power, they abide ever immortal and incorruptible. Whence also, whereas the flesh is born of Mary Mother of God, He Himself is said to have been born, who furnishes to others a generation of being;

in order that, by His transferring our generation into Himself, we may no longer, as mere earth, return to earth, but as being knit into the Word from heaven, may be carried to heaven by Him. Therefore in like manner not without reason has He transferred to Himself the other affections of the body also; that we, no longer as being men, but as the Word's own, may have share in eternal life. For no longer according to that former generation in Adam do we die; but henceforward, our generation and all infirmity of flesh being transferred to the Word, we rise from the earth, the curse by reason of sin being removed, because of Him who is in us and who has become a curse for us. And with reason; for as we are all from earth and die in Adam, so being regenerated from above of water and Spirit, in the Christ we are all quickened; the flesh being no longer earthly, but being henceforth made the Word, by reason of God's Word who for our sake *became flesh.* Ed. Ben. iii. § 32—34.

271. And that one may attain to a more exact knowledge of the impassibility of the Word's nature and of the infirmities ascribed to Him because of the flesh, it will be well to listen to the blessed Peter; for he will be a trustworthy witness concerning the Saviour. He writes then in his Epistle thus: *Christ then having suffered for us in the flesh.* Therefore also when He is said to hunger and thirst, and to toil, and not to know, and to sleep, and to weep, and to ask, and to flee, and to be born, and to deprecate the cup, and in a word to undergo all that belongs to the flesh, let it be said, as is congruous, in each case, "Christ then hungering and thirsting *for us in the flesh;*" and "saying He did not know, and being buffeted, and toiling *for us in the flesh;*" and "being exalted too, and born, and growing *in the flesh;*" and "fearing and hiding *in the flesh;*" and "saying *If it be possible let this cup pass from Me,* and being beaten, and receiving gifts, *for us in the flesh;*" and in a word all such things *for us*

CH. XXVII. *in the flesh.* For on this account has the Apostle himself said, *Christ then having suffered*, not in His Godhead, but *for us in the flesh*, that these affections may be acknowledged as, not proper to the very Word by nature, but proper by nature to the very flesh.

272. Let no one then stumble at these human affections, but rather let a man know that in nature the Word Himself is impassible, and yet because of that flesh which He put on, these things are ascribed to Him, since they belong to the flesh, and the body itself belongs to the Saviour. And while He Himself, being impassible in nature, remains as He is, not harmed by these affections, but rather obliterating and destroying them, men, their passions as if changed and abolished in the Impassible, henceforth become also impassible themselves and free from them for ever, as John teaches when he says, *And ye know that He was manifested to take away our sins, and in Him is no sin.* And this being so, no heretic shall object, "Wherefore rises the flesh, being by nature mortal? and if it rises, why not hunger too and thirst, and suffer, and remain mortal? for it came from the earth, and how can its natural condition pass from it?" because the flesh is able now to make answer to this so contentious heretic, "I am from earth, being by nature mortal, but afterwards I became the Word's flesh, and He *carried* my affections, though He is without them; and so I became free from them, being no more abandoned to their service, because of the Lord who has made me free from them. For if thou makest it a difficulty that I am rid of that corruption which is by nature, next thou wilt be making it a difficulty that God's Word took my form of servitude; for as the Lord, putting on the body, became man, so we men are made gods by the Word, as being taken to Him through His flesh, and henceforward inherit life everlasting."

273. These points we have found it necessary first to

discuss, that, when we see Him doing or saying aught divinely through the instrument of His own body, we may know that He so works, as being God; and also, if we see Him speaking or suffering humanly, we may not be ignorant that, by bearing flesh, He became man, and hence He so acts and so speaks. For if we recognise what belongs to each, and see and understand that both these things and those are done by One, we are right in our faith, and shall never go astray. But if a man, looking at what is done divinely by the Word, deny the body, or looking at what is proper to the body, deny the Word's presence in the flesh, or from what is human entertain low thoughts concerning the Word, such a one, as a Jewish vintner,[4] mixing water with the wine, will account the Cross an offence, or as a Gentile, will deem the preaching to be folly. This then is what happens to God's enemies the Arians; for looking at what is human in the Saviour, they have judged Him a creature. They ought in consistency, looking also at the divine works of the Word, to deny the birth of His body, and henceforth to rank themselves with Manichees. As to them, however, let them learn, though tardily, that *the Word became flesh;* and let us, retaining the general scope of the faith, acknowledge that what they interpret ill, has a right interpretation. ED. BEN. iii. § 34—35.

Chapter XXVIII.

Answer to objections from Scripture; tenthly, Matthew xxviii. 18, *John* iii. 35, *&c.*

274. For, *The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into His hand;* and, *All things are given unto Me of*

[4] Vid. pp. 26, 352.

CH. XXVIII. *My Father;* and, *I can do nothing of Myself, but as I hear, I judge;* and the like passages, do not show that the Son once had not these prerogatives,—(for had not He eternally what the Father has, who is the Only Word and Wisdom of the Father in substance, who also says, *All that the Father hath are Mine*, and what are Mine, are the Father's? for if the things of the Father are the Son's and the Father hath them ever, it is plain that what the Son hath, being the Father's, was ever in the Son)—not then because once He had them not, did He say this, but because, whereas the Son hath eternally what He hath, yet He hath them from the Father. For lest a man, perceiving that the Son has all that the Father hath, from the unvarying likeness and identity of that He hath, should wander into the impiety of Sabellius, considering Him to be the Father, therefore He has said *Is given unto Me*, and *I have received*, and *Are delivered to Me*, only to show that He is not the Father, but the Father's Word, and the Eternal Son, who because of His likeness to the Father, hath eternally what He hath from Him, and because He is the Son, hath from the Father what eternally He hath.

275. Moreover, that *Is given* and *Are delivered*, and the like, do not impair the Godhead of the Son, but rather show Him to be truly Son, we may learn from the passages themselves. For if all things are delivered unto Him, first, He is other than that all which He has received; next, being specially heir, He alone can be the Son, and proper to the Father according to Substance. For if He were one out of all, then He were not *heir* specially, but every one of that all would have received according as the Father willed and gave. But now, as receiving all things, He is other than them all, and alone proper to the Father.

276. Moreover, that *Is given* and *Are delivered* do not show that once He had them not, we prove as regards this and the like passages from a special instance; for the Saviour

Himself says, *As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given also to the Son to have life in Himself.* Ed. Ben. iii. § 36—37.

Now from the words *Hath given*, He signifies that He is not the Father; but in saying *so*, He shows the Son's natural resemblance and belonging to the Father. If then once the Father had not, then indeed the Son once had not; for as the Father, *so* also the Son has. But if this is impious to say, and orthodox on the contrary to say that the Father had ever, is it not extravagant in them when the Son says that, *as* the Father has, *so* also the Son has, to say that He has not *so*, but otherwise? No, rather is the Word faithful, and all things which He says that He has received, He has had always, and "from" the Father; and the Father indeed not from any, but the Son from the Father. For as in the instance of the radiance, if the radiance itself should say, "All places the light hath given me to enlighten, and I do not enlighten from myself, but as the light wills," yet in saying this, it does not imply that it once had not, but it means, "I am proper to the light, and all things of the light are mine;" so, and much more, must we understand in the instance of the Son. For the Father, having given all things to the Son, in the Son still hath all things; and, the Son having, still the Father hath them; for the Son's Godhead is the Father's Godhead, and thus the Father in the Son takes the oversight of all things.

277. And while such is the sense of these passages, those too which speak humanly concerning the Saviour, admit of a religious meaning also. For with this end have we examined them beforehand, that, if we should hear Him asking where Lazarus is laid, or when He asks on coming into the parts of Cæsarea, *Whom do men say that I am?* or, *How many loaves have ye?* and, *What will ye that I shall do unto you?* we may know, from what has been already said, the orthodox sense of the passages, and may not stumble with the Christ-opposing Arians. First then we

CH. XXVIII. must put this question to them, Why do they consider Him ignorant? for one who asks, does not for certain ask from ignorance; but it is possible for one who knows, still to ask concerning what he knows. Thus John was aware that Christ, when asking, *How many loaves have ye?* was not ignorant, for he says, *And this He said to prove him, for He Himself knew what He would do.* But if He knew what He was doing, therefore not in ignorance but with knowledge, did He ask. From this instance we may understand similar ones; that, when the Lord asks, He does not ask in ignorance, where Lazarus lies,—nor again, whom men do say that He is, but knowing the thing which He was asking, and aware what He was about to do; and thus with ease is their sophism overthrown.

278. Next, if they still persist on account of His asking, then they must be told that in the Godhead indeed ignorance is not, but to the flesh ignorance is proper, as has been said. And that this is really so, observe how the Lord who inquired where Lazarus lay, Himself said, when He was not on the spot but a great way off, *Lazarus is dead*, and where he was dead; and how that it was He who is considered by them as ignorant who foreknew the reasonings of the disciples, and was aware of what was in the heart of each, and of *what was in man*, and, what is greater, who alone knows the Father and says, *I in the Father and the Father in Me.* Therefore this is clear to every one, that the flesh indeed is ignorant, but the Word Himself, considered as the Word, knows all things even before they happen. For He did not, when He became man, cease to be God; nor, whereas He is God, does He shrink from what is man's; perish the thought; but rather, being God, He has taken to Him the flesh, and being in the flesh makes the flesh god. For as He asked questions in it, so also in it did He raise the dead; and He made it clear to all that He who quickens the dead and recalls the soul, much more doth

He discern the secrets of all. And He knew where Lazarus lay, and yet He asked; for the All-holy Word of God, who endured all things for our sakes, did this, that, thus carrying our ignorance, He might vouchsafe to us the knowledge of His own only and true Father, and of Himself, who was sent because of us for the salvation of all, than which no grace could be greater.

279. When then the Saviour uses the words which they allege in their defence, *Power is given to Me*, and *Glorify Thy Son*, and Peter says, *Power is given unto Him*, we understand all these passages alike, viz., thus humanly because of the body He says all this. For though He had no need, nevertheless He is said to have received what He received humanly, that on the other hand, inasmuch as the Lord has received, and the grant is lodged with Him, the grace may remain sure to us. For while mere man receives, he is liable to lose again, (as was shown in the case of Adam, for he received and he lost,) but that the grace may be irrevocable, and may be kept sure for men, therefore He Himself appropriates the gift; and He says that He has received power, as man, which He ever has as God, and He who glorifies others, says, *Glorify Me*, to show that that very flesh which He has taken has need of these things. Wherefore, when the flesh receives, since that which receives is in Him, and He by taking it hath become man, therefore He is said Himself to have received. If then, (as has so often been said,) the Word did not become man, then let Him be said to receive, and to need, and to be ignorant, as you would have it; but if He has become man, (and He has,) and it attaches to man to receive, and to need, and to be ignorant, wherefore do we consider the Giver as receiver? and the Dispenser to others why do we suspect to be in need? and why divide the Word from the Father, as imperfect and needy, to the stripping human nature of grace? For if indeed the Word Himself, con-

CH. XXVIII. sidered as Word, has received and been glorified for His own sake, and if He according to His Godhead is He who is sanctified and has risen again, what hope is there for men? for they remain as they were, naked, and wretched, and dead, having no interest in the things given to the Son. Why too did the Word come among us, and become flesh? If for His own receiving these things, which He says that He has received, then He was without them before that, and of necessity will rather Himself owe thanks to the body, because, when He came into it, then He received these things from the Father, which He had not before His descent into the flesh. For on this showing He seems rather to be Himself promoted because of the body, than the body promoted because of Him. But this notion is Judaic. But if in order to ransom mankind, the Word did come among us, and if in order to hallow them and make them gods, the Word became flesh (and for this He did come), who does not see that it follows, that what He says that He received, when He became flesh, such things He mentions, not for His own sake, but for the flesh? for to it, in which He was speaking, pertained the gifts bestowed through Him from the Father.

280. Now let us see what He asked, and what the things altogether were which He said that He had received, that in this way perhaps our opponents may be brought to some proper feeling. He asked then for glory, yet He had said *All things are delivered unto Me.* And after the resurrection, He says that He has received *all power;* however, even before He had said, *All things are delivered unto Me;* and He was Lord of all, for *all things were made by Him*, and *there was One Lord by whom are all things.* And when He asked glory, He was as He is, the Lord of glory, as Paul says, *If they had known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory;* for He already had that glory which He asked for when He said, *the glory which I had with Thee before the*

world was. Also the power which He said He received after the resurrection, that He had before He received it, and before the resurrection. For He of Himself rebuked Satan, saying, *Get thee behind Me, Satan;* and to the disciples He gave the power against Satan, when on their return He said, *I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven.* And again, that what He said that He had received, this He possessed before receiving it, appears from His driving away the devils, and from His unbinding what Satan had bound, as He did in the case of the daughter of Abraham; and from His remitting sins, saying to the paralytic, and to the woman who anointed His feet, *Thy sins be forgiven thee;* and from His both raising the dead, and repairing the original nature of the blind, granting to him to see. And all this He did not, waiting till He should receive, but being *possessed of power.* Ed. Ben. iii. § 39—41.

281. From all this it is plain that the attributes which He had as Word, those when He had become man and was risen again, He says that He received as man; that for His sake men might henceforward upon earth have power against devils, as having become partakers of a divine nature; and in heaven, as being delivered from corruption, might reign everlastingly. Thus He must acknowledge this once for all, that nothing which He says that He received, did He receive as not possessing before; for the Word, as being God, had Himself those prerogatives always; but in these passages He is said humanly Himself to have received, in order that the flesh, which was man's, receiving them in Him, henceforth from It the gift might pass, and might abide surely for us. For what is said by Peter, *receiving from God honour and glory, Angels being subject unto Him*, has this meaning; for as He inquired humanly, and raised Lazarus divinely, so *He received* is spoken of Him humanly, but the subjection of the Angels marks the Word's Godhead.

CH. XXVIII. 282. Cease then, wicked men, degrade not the Word; nor detract from His Godhead, which is the Father's, as though He needed or were ignorant; lest you be flinging blasphemous thoughts of your own imagining against the Christ, like the Jews who once actually stoned Him. For these do not belong to the Word, as the Word; but are proper to men; and, as when He spat, and stretched forth the hand, and called Lazarus, we did not say that the triumphs were human, though they were done through the body, but were God's, so, on the other hand, though human things are ascribed to the Saviour in the Gospel, still, considering the nature of what is said and that they are foreign to God, let us impute them, not to the Word's Godhead, but to His manhood. For though the *Word became flesh*, yet to the flesh only do these affections belong; and though in the Word the flesh is God-inhabited, yet to the Word belong the grace and the power. He then through the flesh did the Father's works, and He again, quite as truly in that flesh displayed the affections of the flesh; for instance, He inquired and He raised Lazarus, He chid His Mother, saying *My hour is not yet come*, yet then at once He made the water wine. For He was Very God in the flesh, and He was true flesh in the Word. Therefore from His works He revealed both Himself as Son of God, and His own Father, and from the affections of the flesh He showed that He bore a true body, and that it too was proper to Him.

CHAPTER XXIX.

Answer to objections from Scripture; eleventhly, Mark xiii. 32, *and Luke* ii. 52.

283. THESE things being so, let us now go on to examine the passage, *But of that day and that hour knoweth no*

man, neither the Angels of God, nor the Son; for they think they have in it an important argument for their heresy. But I, when the heretics allege it and arm themselves with it, see in them the giants again fighting against God.[5] For the Lord of heaven and earth, by whom all things were made, has to litigate before them about day and hour; and the all-knowing Word is accused by them of ignorance about a day; and the Son who knows the Father is said to be ignorant of an hour of a day; now what can be spoken more contrary to sense, or what madness can be likened to this? Through the Word all things were made, times and seasons and night and day and the whole creation; and is the Framer of all said to be ignorant of His work?[6] And the very context of the passage shows that the Son of God knows that hour and that day, though the Arians fall headlong in their ignorance. For after saying, *nor the Son*, He relates to the disciples the approaches of the day, saying, "This and that shall be, and then the end." But He who speaks of the antecedents of the day, knows certainly the day itself, which is to be manifested after the things foretold. But if He had not known the hour, He had not signified the events previous to it, as not knowing when it should be. And as any one, who, by way of pointing out the site of a house or city to those who were ignorant of it, gave an account of what met the eye before arriving at it, and having described all particulars, said, "Then

Ed. Ben. iii. § 41—42.

[5] *ὡς τοὺς γίγαντες*, so de Decr. § 32. Also *τοὺς μυθευομένους γίγαντας*, Orat. ii. § 32, (supr. Disc. n 144.) And so Nazianzen of the disorderly Bishops during the Arian ascendency, Orat. xliii. 26. Also Socr. v. 10, of the heretics in the time of Theodosius. In Hist. Arian. 74, Constantius is called a *γίγας*. Sometimes the Scripture giants are spoken of, sometimes the mythological. The same idea is implied as is expressed in the word *θεομάχος*.

[6] Here again, as so often before, Athan. instances his usual mode of argument by appealing to Scripture as interpreted by the broad outline of its teaching and the tradition of the Church. Before this grand unequivocal sense particular difficulties from outlying passages are dissolved and disappear.

CH. XXIX. immediately comes the city or the house," would know, of course, where the house or the city was, (for had he not known, he had not described these antecedents, lest from ignorance he should throw his hearers far out of the way, or in speaking he should unawares go beyond the object,) so the Lord, saying what shall precede that day and that hour, knows exactly, not is ignorant, when the hour and the day are come.

284. Now why it was that, though He knew, He did not tell His disciples plainly at that time, no one may be curious about, since He has been silent Himself; for *Who hath known the mind of the Lord, or who hath been His counsellor?* but why, though He knew, He said, *no, not the Son knows*, of this I think none of the faithful is ignorant viz., that He made this, as well as those other declarations, as man, by reason of the flesh. For this as little as the other's is the Word's deficiency, but of that human nature whose property it is to be ignorant. And this again will be well seen by honestly examining into the occasion, when and to whom the Saviour spoke thus. Not then when the heaven was made by Him, nor when the Word was with the Father Himself, *disposing all things*, nor before He became man, did He say it, but when *the Word became flesh.* On this account it is reasonable to ascribe to His manhood every thing which, after He became man, He speaks as man. For it belongs to the Word to know what was made, and not be ignorant either of the beginning or the end of these, (they are His works,) and He knows how many things He has wrought, and the limit of their consistence. And, knowing the beginning and the end of each, He knows surely the general and common end of all.

285. Certainly when He says in the Gospel concerning Himself in His humanity, *Father, the hour is come, glorify Thy Son*, it is plain that He knows also the hour of the

end of all things, as being the Word, though as man He is ignorant of it, for ignorance is proper to man, and especially ignorance of these things. Moreover this is proper to the Saviour's love of man; for since He was made man, He is not ashamed, because of the flesh which is ignorant, to say "I know not," that He may show that knowing as God, He is but ignorant according to the flesh. And therefore He said not, "no, not the Son of God knows," lest the Godhead should seem ignorant, but simply, *no, not the Son*, that the ignorance might be the Son's as born from among men. On this account, He introduces the Angels, but He did not go further and say, "not the Holy Ghost;" but He was silent with a double intimation: first, that if the Spirit knew, much more must the Word know, considered as the Word, from whom the Spirit receives; and next, by His silence about the Spirit, He made it clear that it was of the Son's human economy that He said, *no, not the Son knows*.[7] Ed. Ben. iii. § 42—44

286. And a proof of it is this: that, when He had spoken humanly *No, not the Son knows*, He yet shows that divinely He knew all things. For that Son whom He declares not to know the day, Him He declares to know the Father; for *No one*, He says, *knoweth the Father save the Son*. And all men but the Arians would join in confessing, that He who knows the Father, much more knows the whole history of the creation; and in that whole, its end. And if already the day and the hour be determined by the Father, it is plain that through the Son are they determined, and He knows Himself what through Him has been determined; for there is nothing but has come to be and has been determined through the Son. Therefore He, being the Framer of the universe, knows of what nature, and of what magnitude, and with

[7] It should be borne in mind that our Lord is Son, not only in His Divine nature, but also in His human.

CH. XXIX. what limits, the Father has willed it to be made; and in the how much and how far is included its changings. And again, if all that is the Father's is the Son's, (and this He Himself has said,) and it is the Father's attribute to know the day, it is plain that the Son too knows it, having this belonging to Him from the Father. And again, if the Son be in the Father and the Father in the Son, and the Father knows the day and the hour, it is clear that the Son, being in the Father and knowing the things of the Father, knows Himself also the day and the hour. And if the Son is also the Father's Very Image, and the Father knows the day and the hour, it is plain that the Son has this likeness also to the Father of knowing them. And it is not wonderful if He, through whom all things were made, and in whom the universe consists, Himself knows what has been brought into being, and when the end will be of each and of all together; rather is it wonderful that this recklessness, suitable though it be to the Ario-maniacs, should have forced us to have recourse to so long an explanation. For ranking the Son of God, the Eternal Word, among things that have been made, they are gradually training themselves to maintain that the Father Himself is second to the creation; for if He who knows the Father knows not the day nor the hour, I fear lest knowledge about the creation, or rather of the lower portion of it, be something more rare and precious in their wild estimation than knowledge concerning the Father.

287. But for them, since they thus blaspheme the Spirit, they must look for no forgiveness ever of impiety such as this, as the Lord has said; but for us, who love Christ and bear Christ within us, we know that the Word, not as if ignorant, considered as Word, said *I know not*, (for He knows,) but in order to show His manhood, since to be ignorant belongs to man, and because He had put on a flesh that was ignorant, therefore it was that He said accord-

ing to the flesh, *I know not.* And for this reason, after saying, *No, not the Son knows*, and mentioning the ignorance of the men in Noe's day, immediately He added, "*Watch therefore, for you too know not in what hour your Lord doth come*," and again, "*In such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh;* and it was for your sake that I, on becoming as you, said *no, not the Son*, for, if I, as man, am ignorant, how much more you." For, if ignorant divinely, He must have said, "Watch therefore, for I know not," and, "In an hour when I think not;" but in fact this hath He not said; but by saying *Ye know not*, and *When ye think not*, He has signified that it belongs to man to be ignorant; for whose sake He too, having a flesh like theirs and having become man, said *No, not the Son knows*, for He knew not in flesh, though knowing as Word. Ed. Ben. iii. § 44—46

288. And again in the instance of Noe, there too He said, not, "I know not," but, *they knew not until the flood came.* For men did not know, but He who brought the flood (and it was the Saviour Himself) knew the day and the hour in which He opened the windows of heaven, and broke up the fountains of the great deep, and said to Noe, *Come thou and all thy house into the ark.* For were He ignorant, He had not foretold to Noe, *Yet seven days and I will bring a flood upon the earth.* But if in describing the day, He makes use of the parallel of Noe's time, and He did know the day of the flood, therefore He knows also the day of His own appearing. Moreover, after narrating the parable of the Virgins, again He shows more clearly who they are who are ignorant of the day and the hour, saying, *Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour.* He who said shortly before, *No one knoweth, no, not the Son*, now says, not "I know not," but *ye know not.* In like manner then, when His disciples asked about the end, suitably said He then, *no, nor the Son*, according to the flesh because of the body; that He might show that, as man, He

CH. XXIX. knows not; for ignorance is proper to man. If however He is the Word, if it is He who is to come, He to be Judge, He to be the Bridegroom, it is incredible that He should not know when and in what hour He cometh, and when He is to say, *Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.* For as, on becoming man, He hungers and thirsts and suffers with men, so with men, as man, He knows not, though divinely, being in the Father Word and Wisdom, He knows, and there is nothing which He knows not.

289. In like manner also about Lazarus, He asks humanly, He who was on His way to raise him, and knew whence He should recall Lazarus's soul; and it was a greater thing to know where the soul was than to know where the body lay; but He asked humanly, that He might raise divinely. So too He asks of the disciples, on coming into the parts of Cæsarea, though knowing even before Peter made answer. For if the Father revealed to Peter the answer to the Lord's question, it is plain that through the Son was the revelation, for *No one knoweth the Son*, saith He, *but the Father, neither the Father but the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son shall reveal Him.* But if through the Son is revealed the knowledge concerning both the Father and the Son, there is no room for doubting that the Lord who asked, having first revealed it to Peter from the Father, next asked humanly; in order to show that, asking after the flesh, He knew divinely what Peter was about to say. The Son then knew, as knowing all things, and knowing His own Father, than which knowledge nothing can be greater or more perfect.

290. This is sufficient to confute them; but I could wish to ask them a question. The Apostle, in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, writes, *I knew a man in Christ, above fourteen years ago, whether in the body I do not know, or whether out of the body I do not know; God knoweth.*

Now what say ye? Knew the Apostle what had happened to him in the vision, though he says *I know not*, or knew he not? If he knew not, see to it, lest ye err in the trespass[8] of the Phrygians, who say that the Prophets and the other ministers of the Word know neither what they do nor what they announce. But if he knew when he said *I know not*, for he had Christ within him revealing to him all things, is not the heart of these men in very truth perverted and *self-condemned?* for when the Apostle says, *I know not*, they say that he knows; but when the Lord says, "I know not," they say that He does not know. For if, since Christ was within him, Paul knew that of which he says, *I know not*, does not much more Christ Himself know, though He say, "I know not?" The Apostle then, the Lord revealing it to him, knew what happened to him, for on this account he says, *I knew a man in Christ;* and knowing the man, he knew also how the man was caught away. Thus Eliseus, who beheld Elias, knew also how he was taken up; but, though knowing, yet when the sons of the Prophets thought that Elias was cast upon one of the mountains by the Spirit, he, knowing from the first what he had seen, tried to persuade them; but when they urged it, he was silent, and suffered them to go after him. Did he then not know, because he was silent? he knew indeed, but as if not knowing, he suffered them, that they, being convinced, might no more doubt about the assumption of Elias. Therefore much more Paul, himself being the person caught away, knew also how he was caught; for Elias knew; and had any one asked, he would have said how. And yet Paul says *I know not*, for these two reasons, (as I think at least,) one, as he has said himself, lest, because of the abundance of the revelations, any one should think of him beyond what he saw; the other, be-

Ed. Ben. iii. § 46–47.

[8] *παρανομίαν*, vid. supr. Disc. n. 226 note [3], p. 359, Phrygians, i.e., Montanists, supr. p. 67.

CH. XXIX. cause, our Saviour having said "I know not," it became him also to say *I know not*, lest the servant should appear above his Lord, and the disciple above his Master. Therefore He who gave to Paul to know, much rather knew Himself; for since He spoke of the antecedents of the day, He also knew, as I said before, when the Day and when the Hour, and yet, though knowing, He says, *No, not the Son knoweth.*

291. Why then said He at that time "I know not," what He, as Lord, knew? As we may on careful consideration conjecture, (as I think at least,) for our profit did He this; and may He grant that our explanation be a true one! On both sides did the Saviour secure our advantage; for if He hath made known what will come before the end, it is that, as He said Himself, we may not be startled nor scared when the things happen, but from them may expect the end after them. On the other hand, concerning the day and the hour, He was not willing to say according to His divine nature, "I know," but after the flesh, "I know not," for the sake of the flesh which was ignorant, as I have said before; lest they should ask Him further, and then either He should have to pain the disciples by not speaking, or by speaking might act to the prejudice of them and us all. For whatever He does, that altogether He does for our sakes, since also for us *the Word became flesh.* For us therefore He said *No, not the Son knoweth;* and neither was He untrue in thus saying, (for He said humanly, as man, "I know not,") nor did He give an opening for the disciples to force Him to speak, for by saying "I know not" He stopped their inquiries.

292. And so in the Acts of the Apostles it is written, when He went up upon the Angels, ascending as man, and carrying up to heaven the flesh which He bore, on the disciples seeing this, and again asking, "When shall the end be, and when wilt Thou be present?" He said to

them more clearly, *It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in His own power.* And He did not then say, *No, not the Son*, as He said before humanly, but, *It is not for you to know.* For now the flesh had risen and put off its mortality and been deified; and no longer did it become Him to answer according to the flesh when He was going into the heavens; but henceforth to teach after a divine manner, *It is not for you to know times or seasons which the Father hath put in His own arbitrement; but ye shall receive Power.* And what is that Power of the Father but the Son? for Christ is *God's Power and God's Wisdom.* The Son then did know, as being the Word; for He implied this in what He said,—"I know, but it is not for you to know; for it was for your sakes that, sitting also on the mount, I said according to the flesh, *No, not the Son knoweth*, for the profit of you and all. For it is profitable to you to hear this both about the Angels, and about the Son, because of the deceivers which shall be afterwards; that though demons should be transfigured as Angels, and should attempt to speak concerning the end, you should not believe, since they are ignorant; and that, if Antichrist too, disguising himself, should say, 'I am Christ,' and should try in his turn to speak of that day and that end, to deceive the hearers, ye, having these words from Me, *No, not the Son*, may believe him no more than the rest." Ed. Ben. iii. § 47—49.

293. And further, not to know when the end is, or when the day of the end, is expedient for men, lest knowing, they may become negligent of the time between, awaiting the day near the end; for they will argue that then only will they have to attend to themselves. Therefore also has He been silent of the time when each shall die, lest men, being elated on the ground of knowledge, should forthwith neglect themselves for the greater part of their time. Both, then, the end of all things and the limit of

CH. XXIX. each of us hath the Word concealed from us, (for in the end of all is the end of each, and in the end of each the end of all is comprehended,) that, whereas it is uncertain and always in prospect, we may advance day by day as if summoned, reaching forward to the things before us and forgetting the things behind. For who, knowing the day of the end, would not be dilatory as regards the interval? but who, as being ignorant, does not get ready day by day? It was on this account that the Saviour added, *Watch therefore, for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come;* and, *in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of man cometh.* For the advantage then which comes of ignorance has He said this; for in saying it, He wishes that we should always be prepared; "for you know not," He says; "but I, the Lord, know when it is that I come, though the Arians do not wait for Me, who am the Word of the Father." The Lord then, knowing what is good for us beyond ourselves, thus secured the disciples; and they, being thus taught, set right those of Thessalonica, when likely on this point to run into error.

294. However, to ask Christ's enemies again concerning this:—In Paradise God asks, *Adam, where art thou?* and He inquires of Cain also, *Where is Abel, thy brother?* What then say you to this? for if you think Him ignorant and therefore to have asked, you are already of the party of the Manichees, for this is their bold thought; but if, fearing the open name, ye force yourselves to say, that He knows, and yet He asks, what is there extravagant or strange in the doctrine, that ye should thus fall off, on finding that the Son, in whom God then inquired, He that same Son, now clad in flesh, inquires of the disciples as man? unless forsooth having become Manichees, you are willing to blame the question then put to Adam, and all that you may give full play to your perverseness.

295. For being exposed on all sides, you fall back upon

the words of Luke, muttering words which are appropriately said by him, but ill understood by you, ——— and are as follows, *And Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature, and in grace with God and man.* This then is the passage, and the case stands thus: Is Jesus Christ man, as all other men, or is He God bearing flesh? If He is an ordinary man as the rest, then let Him, as a man, "advance;" this however is the sentiment of the Samosatene, which virtually indeed you entertain also, though in name you deny it because of men. But if He be God bearing flesh, as He truly is, and *the Word became flesh*, and being God descended upon earth, what advance had He who existed equal to God? or how had the Son increase, being ever in the Father? For if He who was ever in the Father, advances, what, I ask, is there beyond the Father from which His advance might be made? Next it is suitable here to repeat what was said upon the point of His receiving and being glorified. If He advanced when He became man, it is plain that, before He became man, He was imperfect; and rather the flesh became to Him a cause of perfection, than He to the flesh. And again, if, as being the Word, He advances, what has He more to become than Word and Wisdom and Son and God's Power? For the Word is all these, of which if any one can anyhow partake as it were one ray, such a man becomes all-perfect among men, and equal to Angels. For Angels, and Archangels, and Dominions, and all the Powers and Thrones, as partaking the Word, behold always the face of His Father. How then does He who to others supplies perfection, Himself advance at a later date? For Angels even ministered to His human birth, and the passage from Luke comes later than the ministration of the Angels. How then at all can this even come into thought of man? or how did Wisdom advance in wisdom? or how did He who to others gives grace, (as

Ed. Ben. iii. § 49—51.

CH. XXIX. Paul says in every Epistle, knowing that through Him grace is given, *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all,*) how did He advance in grace? for either let them say that the Apostle is untrue, and presume to say that the Son is not Wisdom, or else, if He is Wisdom as Solomon has said, and if Paul has written, *Christ, God's Power and God's Wisdom*, of what advance did Wisdom admit further?

296. For men, creatures as they are, are capable in a certain way of reaching forward and advancing in virtue. Enoch, for instance, was thus translated, and Moses increased and was perfected; and Isaac *by advancing became great;* and the Apostle said that he *reached forth* day by day to what was before him. For each had room for advancing, looking to the step before him. But the Son of God, who is One and Only, what room had He for reaching forward? for all things advance by looking at Him; and He, being One and Only, is in the Only Father, out of whom never does He reach, but in Him abideth ever. To men then belongs advance; but the Son of God, since He could not advance, being perfect in the Father, humbled Himself for us, that in His humiliation we rather might have capacity to increase. This is the real advance, the deifying and grace imparted from Wisdom to men, sin being obliterated in them and their inward corruption, according to their likeness and relationship to the flesh of the Word. And our increase is no other than the renouncing things sensible, and growing up into the Word Himself, since He never was low except in His taking our flesh. It was not then the Word, considered as the Word, who advanced, who is perfect from the perfect Father, who needs nothing, nay brings forward others to an advance; but humanly is He here also said to advance, since advance belongs to man. Hence the Evangelist, speaking with cautious exactness, has

mentioned stature in the advance; but being Word and God He is not measured by stature, which belongs to bodies. Of the body then is the advance; for, it advancing, in it advanced also the manifestation of the Godhead to those who saw it. And, as the Godhead was more and more revealed, by so much more did His grace as man increase before all men. For as a child He was simply carried to the Temple; but when He became a boy, He remained there, and questioned the priests about the Law. And by degrees His body increasing, and the Word manifesting Himself in it, He is confessed henceforth by Peter first, then also by all, *Truly this is the Son of God;* however wilfully the Jews, both the ancient and these modern, shut their eyes, lest they should see that to advance in wisdom is not the advance of Wisdom Itself, but rather the manhood's advance in It. *For Jesus advanced in wisdom and grace;* and, if we may speak what is explanatory as well as true, He advanced in Himself; for *Wisdom hath builded Herself an house*, and in Herself She gave the house advancement. For thus, the body increasing in stature, in and with it there progressed the manifestation of the Godhead also, and to all was it displayed that the body was God's Temple, and that God was in the body. Ed. Ben. iii. § 51—53.

297. And if they contend that the Word was called Jesus on becoming flesh, and refer to Him the term *advanced*, they must be told that neither does this impair the Father's Light, which is the Son, but that it does but show again that the Word has become man, and bore true flesh. And as we have said that He suffered in the flesh, and hungered in the flesh, and was fatigued in the flesh, so also reasonably may He be said to have advanced in the flesh; nor again, did this advancement of the flesh, such as above described, take place in the Word while He was apart from it; for it was when the flesh had been taken into Him, and is called His, when in short that advance of human nature in Him was safe and

Ch. XXIX. sure, because of the Word that was with it. ——— Neither then was the advance the Word's, nor was the flesh Wisdom, but the flesh became the body of Wisdom. Therefore, as we have already said, not Wisdom, as Wisdom, advanced in respect of Itself; but the manhood advanced in Wisdom, transcending by degrees human nature, and made god, and becoming and appearing to all as the organ of Wisdom for the operation and the shining forth of the Godhead. Wherefore neither said he, "The Word advanced," but Jesus, by which Name the Lord was called when He became man; so that the advance is of the human nature in such wise as we have above explained.

Chapter XXX.

Answer to objections from Scripture; twelfthly, Matthew xxvi. 39; *John* xii. 27, *&c.*

298. Therefore as, when the flesh advanced, He is said to have advanced, because the body belonged to Him, so also what is said at the season of His death, that He was troubled, that He wept, must be taken in the same sense. For they, going up and down, as if thereby recommending their heresy, allege: "Behold, *He wept*, and said, *Now is My soul troubled*, and He besought that the cup might pass away; how then, if He so spoke, is He God, and Word of the Father?" Yea, it is written that He wept, O God's enemies, and that He said, "I am troubled," and on the Cross He said, *Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani*, that is, *My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?* and He besought that the cup might pass away. Thus certainly it is written; but again I would ask you, (for the same rejoinder must of necessity be made to each of your objections,) if the speaker is mere man, let him weep and

fear death, as being man; but if He is the Word in flesh, (for one must not be reluctant to repeat,) whom had He to fear, being God? or wherefore should He fear death, who was Himself Life, and was rescuing others from death? or how, whereas He said, "Fear not him that kills the body," should He Himself fear him? And how should He who said to Abraham, *Fear not, for I am with thee*, and encouraged Moses against Pharaoh, and said to the son of Nave, *Be strong, and of a good courage*, how should He feel terror before Herod and Pilate? Further, He who succours others against fear, (for *the Lord*, says Scripture, *is on my side, I will not fear what man doeth unto me*,) did He fear governors, mortal men? did He who Himself was come against death, feel terror of death? Is it not both extravagant and impious to say that He was terrified at death or hell, whom the keepers of hell's gate saw and shuddered? But if, as you would hold, the Word was in terror, wherefore, since He spoke of the conspiracy of the Jews long before, did He not flee, instead of saying when actually sought, *I am He?* for He could have avoided death, as He said, *I have power to lay down My life, and I have power to take it again;* and *No one taketh it from Me.* Ed. Ben. iii. § 53–55.

299. But these affections were not proper to the nature of the Word, considered as Word; but in the flesh which was thus affected was the Word, O Christ's enemies and unthankful Jews! For He said not all this prior to the flesh; but when the *Word became flesh*, and became man, then is it written that He said this, that is, humanly. Surely He of whom this is written, was He who raised Lazarus from the dead, and made the water wine, and vouchsafed sight to the man born blind, and said, *I and My Father are one.* If then they make His human attributes a ground for grovelling thoughts concerning the Son of God, nay consider Him altogether *man from the earth*, and not *from heaven*, wherefore not from His

CH. XXX. divine works recognise the Word who is in the Father, and henceforward renounce their self-willed impiety? For it is open for them to see, how He who did those works is the same as He who showed that His body was passible by His permitting it to weep and hunger, and to show other properties of a body. For while by means of such He made it known that God, though impassible, had taken a passible flesh, yet from the great works He showed Himself the Word of God, who had afterwards become man: and He said, "Though ye believe not Me, beholding Me clad in a human body, yet believe the works, that ye may know that *I am in the Father and the Father in Me.*"

300. And these men seem to me to show plain shamelessness and blasphemy; for, when they read *I and the Father are one*, they violently distort the sense, and tear in two the unity of the Father and the Son; but reading of His tears or sweat or sufferings, they do not advert to His body, but on account of these place in the ranks of the creation Him by whom the creation was made. What then is left for them to differ in from the Jews? for as the Jews blasphemously ascribed God's works to Beelzebub, so also will these, ranking with the creatures the Lord who wrought those works, undergo the same condemnation without mercy. But they ought, when they read *I and the Father are one*, to see in Him the oneness of the Godhead and His belonging to the Father's Substance; and again, when they read, *He wept*, and the like, to say that these affections are proper to the body; especially since on this side and that they have an intelligible ground, viz., that this is written as of God, and that with reference to His manhood. For properties of body in the Incorporeal had not been, unless He had taken a body corruptible and mortal; for mortal was Holy Mary, from whom was His body. Wherefore of necessity, when He was in a body which suffered, wept, and toiled, these things which are proper

to the flesh are ascribed to Him together with that body. If then He wept and was troubled, it was not the Word considered as the Word, who wept and was troubled, but it belonged to the flesh; and if too He besought that the cup might pass away, it was not the Godhead that was in terror, but this affection too was proper to the manhood. Ed. Ben. iii. § 55—57.

301. And so as regards the words *Why hast Thou forsaken Me?* that they are His, according to the above explanations, though He suffered nothing, (for the Word was impassible,) is still declared by the Evangelists; since the Lord became man, and these things are done and said as from a man, that He might Himself lighten these very sufferings of the flesh, and set free the flesh from them. Whence neither can the Lord, who is ever in the Father, be forsaken by Him whether before He spoke or even when He uttered these words. Nor is it lawful to say that the Lord was in terror, at whom the keepers of the gates of Hades shuddered and set Hades open, and the earth, knowing its Lord who spoke, straightway trembled, and the veil was rent, and the sun was hidden, and the rocks were torn asunder, and the graves did gape, and the dead in them arose and appeared to their own people; and, what is wonderful, they who were then present and had before denied Him, then seeing these signs, confessed that *truly He was the Son of God.* Therefore be every heretic dumb, nor dare to ascribe terror to the Lord, whom death, as a serpent, flees, at whom demons tremble and the sea is in alarm; for whom the heavens are rent and all the powers are shaken. For behold when He said, *Why hast Thou forsaken Me?* the Father showed that He was ever and even then in Him.

302. And as to His saying, *If it be possible, let the cup pass*, observe how, though He thus spake, He rebuked Peter, saying, *Thou savourest not the things that be of God, but*

Or. XXX. *those that be of men.* For He willed what He was deprecating, for it was for this that He had come; but His was the willing, but the terror belonged to the flesh. Wherefore as man He utters this speech also, and both were said by One and the Same, to show that He was God, willing in Himself, but when He had become man, having a flesh that was in terror. For the sake of this flesh He blended in one His own will with human weakness, that, destroying such affections, He might in turn make man undaunted at the thought of death. Behold then a thing strange indeed! He to whom Christ's enemies impute words of terror, He by that so-called terror renders men undaunted and fearless. And so the Blessed Apostles after Him from such words of His conceived so great a contempt of death, as not even to care for those who questioned them, but to answer, *We ought to obey God rather than men;* and the other Holy Martyrs were so bold as to think that they were rather passing to life than undergoing death.

303 Is it not extravagant then, to admire the courage of the servants of the Word, yet to say that that Word Himself was in terror, through whom they despised death? for that most enduring purpose and courage of the Holy Martyrs demonstrates that the Godhead was not in terror, but that the Saviour took away our terror. For as He abolished death by death, and by human means all human evils, so by this so-called terror did He remove our terror, and brought about for us that never more should men fear death. His word and deed go together. For human were the sounds, *Let the cup pass*, and *Why hast Thou forsaken Me?* and divine the action whereby He the Same did cause the sun to fail and the dead to rise. And so He said humanly, *Now is My soul troubled;* and He said divinely, *I have power to lay down My life, and power to take it again.* For to be troubled was proper to the flesh, but to have power to lay down His life and take it again, when He

would, was no property of men but of the Word's power. For man dies, not at his own arbitrement, but by necessity of nature and against his will; but the Lord being Himself immortal, but having a mortal flesh, had at His own free will, as God, to become separate from the body and to take it again, when He would. Concerning this too, speaks David in the Psalm, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in Hades, neither shalt Thou suffer Thy Holy One to see corruption.* For it beseemed that the flesh, corruptible as it was, should no longer after its own nature remain mortal, but, because of the Word who had put it on, should abide incorruptible. For as He, having come in our body, was conformed to our condition, so we, having received Him, partake of the immortality that is from Him. Ed. Ben. iii. § 57—58.

304. Idle then is the excuse for stumbling, and narrow are the notions concerning the Word, of these Ario-maniacs, from its being written, *He was troubled*, and *He wept.* For they seem not even to have human feeling, if they are thus ignorant of man's nature and properties; properties which do but make it the greater marvel, that He, the Word, though in a suffering flesh, neither prevented those who were conspiring against Him, nor took vengeance on those who were putting Him to death, though He was able, He who hindered some from dying, and raised others from the dead. And He let His own body suffer, for therefore did He come, as I said before, that in the flesh He might suffer, and thenceforth the flesh might be made impassible and immortal, and that, as we have many times said, contumely and the other troubles might fall upon Him but come short of others after Him, being by Him annulled utterly; and that henceforth men might for ever abide incorruptible, as a temple of the Word. Had Christ's enemies thus dwelt on these thoughts, and recognised the Ecclesiastical Scope[9] as an anchor for the faith,

[9] He ends then, as he began, by maintaining that Scripture is

CH. XXX. they would not have *of the faith made shipwreck*, ——— nor been so shameless as to resist those who would fain recover them from their fall, and to deem those as enemies who are exhorting them to orthodoxy.

305. Therefore God[1] the Word Himself is Christ from Mary, God and man;—not some other Christ, but One and the Same; He before ages from the Father, He too in the last times from the Virgin; invisible before, even to the holy powers of heaven, visible now because of His being one with the Man who is visible; seen, I say, not in His invisible Godhead, but in the operation of the Godhead through the human body and whole man, which He has renewed by making it His own,—

To Him be the adoration and the worship, who was before, and now is, and ever shall be, even to all ages. Amen.[2]

to be interpreted, not by its letter, or piecemeal, but by the Ecclesiastical Scope.

[1] From Orat. iv. § 36.

[2] It is an argument for considering that these Discourses ran on to the end of Orat. iv. that there is in the Greek a Doxology at the end of that Orat., viz., that which I have transferred to this place, and none here. This, however, does not touch the plain fact, that the Fourth is both in matter and in composition quite different from the Three to which I have confined myself in this Volume; and of course the question may be asked whether a Doxology is necessarily to be considered an integral portion of the work to which it is attached, and never due to the amanuensis or the transcriber.

THE END.

ABERDEEN UNIVERSITY PRESS

A CLASSIFIED LIST OF WORKS

BY

ROMAN CATHOLIC WRITERS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Beginnings of the Church	12
Belles Lettres	14
Biography	10
Education	20
Fiction	18
For Spiritual Reading	15
For the Clergy and Students	4
For Young People	16
History	7
Lives of the Friar Saints	13
Poetry and Romance	17
Stonyhurst Philosophical Series	2
Westminster Library	3
Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures	2
Works by Cardinal Newman	22
Works by the Author of "The Life of a Prig"	9
Works by the Very Rev. P. A. Canon Sheehan, D.D.	19
Index	30

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.

39 Paternoster Row, London, E.C.

Fourth Avenue and Thirtieth Street, New York

323 East Twenty-Third Street, Chicago

8 Hornby Road, Bombay

303 Bowbazar Street, Calcutta

1914

Stonyhurst Philosophical Series.

Edited by the Rev. RICHARD F. CLARKE, S.J.

Crown 8vo.

Extract from a Letter of His Holiness the Pope to the Bishop of Salford, on the Philosophical Course at Stonyhurst.

"You will easily understand, Venerable Brother, the pleasure We felt in what you reported to Us about the College of Stonyhurst in your diocese, namely, that by the efforts of the Superiors of this College, an excellent course of the exact sciences has been successfully set on foot, by establishing professorships, and by publishing in the vernacular for their students text-books of Philosophy, following the Principles of St. Thomas Aquinas. On this work We earnestly congratulate the Superiors and teachers of the College, and by letter We wish affectionately to express Our good-will towards them."

LOGIC. By the Rev. RICHARD F. CLARKE, S.J. 5s.

FIRST PRINCIPLES OF KNOWLEDGE. By the Rev. JOHN RICKABY, S.J. 5s.

MORAL PHILOSOPHY (Ethics and Natural Law). By the Rev. JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J., M.A. 5s.

NATURAL THEOLOGY. By the Rev. BERNARD BOEDDER, S.J. 6s. 6d.

PSYCHOLOGY, EMPIRICAL AND RATIONAL. By the Rev. MICHAEL MAHER, S.J., D.Litt., M.A. 6s. 6d.

GENERAL METAPHYSICS. By the Rev. JOHN RICKABY, S.J. 5s.

POLITICAL ECONOMY. By CHAS. S. DEVAS, M.A. 7s. 6d.

THEORIES OF KNOWLEDGE: Absolutism, Pragmatism, Realism. By LESLIE J. WALKER, S.J., M.A. 9s.

The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures.

Undertaken with the approval of the Cardinal Archbishop and the Catholic Hierarchy.

Newly Translated from the Original Text. With Introduction, Critical and Explanatory Notes, Appendices, and Maps.

General Editors: The Rev. CUTHBERT LATTEY, S.J., Professor of Sacred Scripture at St. Beuno's College, North Wales, and the Rev. JOSEPH KEATING, S.J., Editor of *The Month*.

The collaboration, as Editors of separate Sections, of the Right Rev. Dr. McINTYRE, Bishop of Lamus; the Right Rev. Mgr. B. WARD, President of St. Edmund's; the Rev. J. P. ARENDZEN, Professor of Sacred Scripture at St. Edmund's; Father HUGH POPE, O.P., of the Collegio Angelico, Rome; Father JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J., of Oxford, and many other leading Catholic Scripture scholars, has been secured.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Vol. I. ST. MATTHEW, ST. MARK, ST. LUKE. *In preparation.*

Vol. II. ST. JOHN, THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. *In preparation.*

Vol. III. ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES TO THE CHURCHES.

Part I. THE EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS. By the Rev. CUTHBERT LATTEY, S.J. 8vo. Paper covers, 6d. *net;* half cloth boards, 1s. *net.*

Part II. THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS. *In the press.*

Vol. IV. THE OTHER CANONICAL EPISTLES: THE APOCALYPSE. *In preparation.*

The Westminster Library.

A Series of Manuals for Catholic Priests and Students.

Edited by the Right Rev. Monsignor BERNARD WARD, President of St. Edmund's College, and the Rev. HERBERT THURSTON, S.J.

Crown 8vo.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST. By the Right Rev. JOHN CUTHBERT HEDLEY, O.S.B., Bishop of Newport. 3s. 6d. *net.*

THE MASS: a Study of the Roman Liturgy. By the Rev. ADRIAN FORTESCUE, Ph.D., D.D. 6s. *net.*

THE NEW PSALTER AND ITS USE. By the Rev. E. H. BURTON, D.D., Vice-President of St. Edmund's College, Ware, and the Rev. EDWARD MYERS, M.A. 3s. 6d. *net.*

THE PRIEST'S STUDIES. By the Very Rev. THOMAS SCANNELL, D.D., Canon of Southwark Cathedral, Editor of *The Catholic Dictionary.* 3s. 6d. *net.*

THE TRADITION OF SCRIPTURE: its Origin, Authority and Interpretation. By the Very Rev. WILLIAM BARRY, D.D., Canon of Birmingham. 3s. 6d. *net.*

THE LEGENDS OF THE SAINTS: An Introduction to Hagiography. From the French of Père H. DELEHAYE, S.J., Bollandist. Translated by Mrs. V. M. CRAWFORD. 3s. 6d. *net.*

NON-CATHOLIC DENOMINATIONS. By the Very Rev. Monsignor ROBERT HUGH BENSON. 3s. 6d. *net.*

The following Volumes are in Preparation :—

THE EARLY CHURCH IN THE LIGHT OF THE MONUMENTS. By the Right Rev. Monsignor A. S. BARNES, M.A. With Illustrations. 5s. *net.*

THE CLERGY AND SOCIAL ACTION. By the Rev. CHARLES PLATER, S.J.

THE INSTRUCTION OF CONVERTS. By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J.

For the Clergy and Students.

PRIMITIVE CATHOLICISM: By Monsignor PIERRE BATIFFOL. Authorised translation by HENRY L. BRIANCEAU, St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, revised by the Author. 8vo. 12s. 6d. *net.*

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL. "Orpheus et l'Évangile." By Monsignor PIERRE BATIFFOL. Translated by the Rev. G. C. H. POLLEN, S.J. With an Appendix giving the Decisions of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, June 19th, 1911, and June 26th, 1912. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d. *net.*

*** *The Appendix will be supplied separately on application to the Publishers.*

HISTORY OF THE ROMAN BREVIARY. By Monsignor PIERRE BATIFFOL. Translated from the Third French Edition, by the Rev. A. M. Y. BAYLAY, M.A. With a New Chapter on the Decree of Pius X. 8vo. 9s. *net.*

HANDBOOK OF THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY. By Dr. ALBERT STÖCKL. Translated by the Rev. T. A. FINLAY, S.J., M.A., National University, Dublin. 2 vols. 8vo.

Vol. I. PRE-SCHOLASTIC AND SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY. 10s. 6d. *net.*

Vol. II. *In preparation.*

SCHOLASTICISM, Old and New: an Introduction to Scholastic Philosophy, Mediæval and Modern. By MAURICE DE WULF, Professor at the University of Louvain. Translated by P. COFFEY, Ph.D. (Louvain), Professor of Logic and Metaphysics, Maynooth College, Ireland. 8vo. 6s. *net.*

HISTORY OF MEDIEVAL PHILOSOPHY. By MAURICE D. WULF. Translated by P. COFFEY, Ph.D. 8vo. 10s. 6d. *net.*

THE SCIENCE OF LOGIC: an Inquiry into the Principles of Accurate Thought and Scientific Method. By P. COFFEY, Ph.D. (Louvain), Professor of Logic and Metaphysics, Maynooth College, Ireland. 2 vols. 8vo.

Vol. I. Conception, Judgment, and Inference. 7s. 6d. *net.*

Vol. II. Method, Science, and Certitude. 7s. 6d. *net.*

MOTIVE-FORCE AND MOTIVATION-TRACKS: a Research in Will Psychology. By E. BOYD BARRETT, S.J., Doctor of Philosophy, Superior Institute, Louvain, M.A., Honours Graduate National University, Ireland. 8vo, 7s. 6d. *net;* paper covers, 6s. *net.*

OUTLINES OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY. By SYLVESTER JOSEPH HUNTER, S.J. Crown 8vo. Three vols. 6s. 6d. each.

STUDIES ON THE GOSPELS. By VINCENT ROSE, O.P., Professor in the University of Fribourg. Translated by ROBERT FRASER, D.D., Domestic Prelate to H.H. Pius X. Crown 8vo. 6s. *net.*

For the Clergy and Students—*continued.*

THEODICY: Essays on Divine Providence. By ANTONIO ROSMINI SERBATI. Translated with some Omissions from the Italian Edition of 1845. 3 vols. Crown 8vo. 21s. *net.*

THOUGHTS OF A CATHOLIC ANATOMIST. By THOMAS DWIGHT, M.D., LL.D., Parkman Professor of Anatomy at Harvard. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. *net.*

ESSAYS IN PASTORAL MEDICINE. By AUSTIN O'MALLEY, M.D., Ph.D., LL.D., Pathologist and Ophthalmologist to Saint Agnes's Hospital, Philadelphia; and JAMES J. WALSH, Ph.D., LL.D., Adjunct Professor of Medicine at the New York Polytechnic School for Graduates in Medicine. 8vo. 10s. 6d. *net.*

*** The term "Pastoral Medicine" may be said to represent that part of medicine which is of import to a pastor in his cure, and those divisions of ethics and moral theology which concern a physician in his practice. This book is primarily intended for Roman Catholic confessors.*

BODILY HEALTH AND SPIRITUAL VIGOUR. A Book for Preachers and Teachers. By WILLIAM J. LOCKINGTON, S.J. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. *net.*

THE SCIENCE OF ETHICS. By Rev. MICHAEL CRONIN, M.A., D.D., Ex-Fellow, Royal University of Ireland; Professor, Clonliffe College, Dublin. 8vo.

Vol. I., General Ethics. 12s. 6d. *net.*

THE OLD RIDDLE AND THE NEWEST ANSWER. An Enquiry how far Modern Science has altered the aspect of the Problem of the Universe. By JOHN GERARD, S.J., F.L.S. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. *net.* Popular Edition. Paper Covers. 6d.

*** An examination of the assumptions of Haeckel's "The Riddle of the Universe".*

THE KEY TO THE WORLD'S PROGRESS: an Essay on Historical Logic, being some Account of the Historical Significance of the Catholic Church. By CHARLES STANTON DEVAS, M.A. Crown 8vo. 5s. *net.* Popular Edition. Paper covers, 6d.

*** The object of this book is to give to the logic and history of Newman an economic or sociological setting, and thus to show that "for the explanation of World-history we must first have the true theory of the Christian Church and her life through eighteen centuries". Part I. states briefly the problems which the philosophy of history seeks to resolve. Part II. presents the solution offered by Christianity and takes the form of an historical analysis of the principles by which the Church has been guided in her relations with the world.*

For the Clergy and Students—*continued.*

THE PRICE OF UNITY. By the Rev. B. W. MATURIN. Crown 8vo. 5s. *net.*

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH FROM WITHIN. With a Preface by His Eminence CARDINAL VAUGHAN, formerly Archbishop of Westminster. Crown 8vo. 6s. 6d. *net.*

CARDINAL NEWMAN AND THE ENCYCLICAL PASCENDI DOMINICI GREGIS. An Essay by the Most Rev. EDWARD THOMAS O'DWYER, Bishop of Limerick. 8vo. Paper Covers, 1s. *net.*

BISHOP GORE AND THE CATHOLIC CLAIMS. By Dom JOHN CHAPMAN, O.S.B. 8vo. Paper Covers, 6d. *net*; cloth, 1s. *net.*

ASPECTS OF ANGLICANISM; or, Some Comments on Certain Incidents in the 'Nineties. By Mgr. JAMES MOYES, D.D., Canon of Westminster Cathedral. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. *net.* Paper Covers, 2s. *net.*

LENT AND HOLY WEEK: Chapters on Catholic Observance and Ritual. By the Rev. HERBERT THURSTON, S.J. Crown 8vo. 6s. *net.*

SOME PAPERS OF LORD ARUNDELL OF WARDOUR, 12th BARON, COUNT OF THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE, Etc. With a Preface by the Dowager LADY ARUNDELL OF WARDOUR. With Portrait. 8vo. 8s. 6d. *net.*

A memorial volume consisting of a collection of Lord Arundell's writings, the thoughts that he wrote down after reading, or which were intended to be spoken in Parliament, to his tenantry, or at public meetings. The contents of the volume are divided as follows: Social Inequality and Natural Right—Home Politics—Pope and Queen—Foreign Politics—The Nature Myth Theory.

PSYCHOLOGY OF POLITICS AND HISTORY. By the Rev. J. A. DEWE, M.A. Crown 8vo. 5s. *net.*

THE REAL DEMOCRACY (First Essays of the Rota Club). By J. E. F. MANN, N. J. SIEVERS, and R. W. T. COX. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d. *net.*

These essays are a defence of the principle of Property as a determining factor in the economic and political structure of the State.

THE MONTH; A Catholic Magazine. Conducted by FATHERS OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS. Published Monthly. 8vo. Paper Covers, 1s.; Covers for binding volumes, 1s. *net.*

INDEX TO THE MONTH, 1864-1908. Arranged under Subjects and Authors. 8vo. Cloth. 3s. 6d. *net.* Interleaved with Writing Paper. 5s. *net.*

STONYHURST PHILOSOPHICAL SERIES.

For particulars see page 2.

History.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF BISHOP CHALLONER, 1691-1781. By EDWIN H. BURTON, D.D., F.R.Hist.S., Vice-President of St. Edmund's College, Ware. With 34 Portraits and other Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo. 25s. *net.*

THE DAWN OF THE CATHOLIC REVIVAL IN ENGLAND, 1781-1803. By the Right Rev. Monsignor BERNARD WARD, F.R.Hist.S., President of St. Edmund's College, Ware. With 38 Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo. 25s. *net.*

THE EVE OF CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION. Being the History of the English Catholics during the first Thirty Years of the Nineteenth Century. By the Right Rev. Monsignor BERNARD WARD, F.R.Hist.S. With Portraits and other Illustrations. 3 vols. 8vo.

Vols. I. and II.—1803-1820. 21s. *net.*

Vol. III.—1820-1829. 12s. 6d. *net.*

THE DOMINICAN REVIVAL IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. Being some Account of the Restoration of the Order of Preachers throughout the World under Father Jandel, the seventy-third Master-General. By Father RAYMUND DEVAS, O.P. With Portraits. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. *net.*

BEGINNINGS, OR GLIMPSES OF VANISHED CIVILIZATIONS. By MARION M'MURROUGH MULHALL, Member of the Roman Arcadia. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. *net.*

History—*continued.*

THE STORY OF ANCIENT IRISH CIVILISATION. By P. W. JOYCE, LL.D., M.R.I.A. Fcp. 8vo. 1s. 6d. *net.*

A SMALLER SOCIAL HISTORY OF ANCIENT IRELAND. By P. W. JOYCE, LL.D., M.R.I.A. With 13 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. *net.*

A SHORT HISTORY OF IRELAND, from the Earliest Times to 1608. By P. W. JOYCE, LL.D., M.R.I.A. With Map. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE ORIGIN AND HISTORY OF IRISH NAMES OF PLACES. By P. W. JOYCE, LL.D., M.R.I.A. 3 vols. Crown 8vo. 5s. each.

THE WONDERS OF IRELAND; and other Papers on Irish Subjects. By P. W. JOYCE, LL.D., M.R.I.A. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. *net.*

STOLEN WATERS: a Page from the Conquest of Ulster. By T. M. HEALY, K.C., M.P., Bencher of King's Inns, Dublin, and of Gray's Inn, London. 8vo. 10s. 6d. *net.*

HISTORY OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS IN NORTH AMERICA: Colonial and Federal. By THOMAS HUGHES of the same Society. Royal 8vo.

TEXT.

Volume I. From the First Colonization, 1580, till 1645. With 3 Maps and 3 Facsimiles. 15s. *net.*

Volume II. *In preparation.*

Volume III. *In preparation.*

DOCUMENTS.

Volume I. Part I. Nos. 1-140 (1605-1838). With 2 Maps and 5 Facsimiles. 21s. *net.*

Volume I. Part II. Nos. 141-224 (1605-1838). With 3 Facsimiles. 21s. *net.*

Works by the Author of "The Life of a Prig," etc.

POLICY AND PAINT; or Some Incidents in the Lives of Dudley Carleton and Peter Paul Rubens. With 14 Illustrations. 8vo. 9s. *net.*

VICES IN VIRTUES AND OTHER VAGARIES. 8vo. 3s. 6d. *net.*

THE FIRST DUKE AND DUCHESS OF NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE. With Portrait and 15 other Illustrations. 8vo. 10s. 6d. *net.*

THE CURIOUS CASE OF LADY PURBECK: A Scandal of the Seventeenth Century. 8vo. 6s. *net.*

PRYINGS AMONG PRIVATE PAPERS: Chiefly of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. 8vo. 7s. 6d. *net.*

ROCHESTER AND OTHER LITERARY RAKES OF THE COURT OF CHARLES II. With some Account of their Surroundings. With 15 Portraits. 8vo. 16s.

FALKLANDS. With 6 Portraits and 2 other Illustrations. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE LIFE OF SIR KENELM DIGBY: By One of his Descendants. With 7 Illustrations. 8vo. 16s.

THE ADVENTURES OF KING JAMES II. OF ENGLAND. With an Introduction by the Right Rev. F. A. GASQUET, D.D. With 27 Portraits and other Illustrations. 8vo. 13s. 6d. *net.*

CHISEL, PEN AND POIGNARD: Or, Benvenuto Cellini, his Times and his Contemporaries. With 19 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 5s.

MARSHAL TURENNE. With an Introduction by Brigadier-General FRANCIS LLOYD, C.B., D.S.O. With numerous Illustrations. 8vo. 12s. 6d. *net.*

Biography, etc.

CONFESSIONS OF A CONVERT. By the Very Rev. Monsignor ROBERT HUGH BENSON. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. *net.*

This is the record of the author's religious life and development, with accounts of the various stages of belief through which he passed, and of the influences which bore upon him. The book includes sketches of his home education, his school life, his ministry as a parochial clergyman in town and country, his membership in an Anglican Religious community; and finally the stages by which he came to submit to Rome and his experiences in the city itself. The book is not definitely controversial; it is rather narrative and descriptive.

BACK TO HOLY CHURCH: Experiences and Knowledge acquired by a Convert. By Dr. ALBERT VON RUVILLE, Professor of History at the University of Halle, Germany. Translated by G. SCHOETENSACK. Edited with a Preface by the Very Rev. Monsignor ROBERT HUGH BENSON. With Portrait. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. *net.*

APOLOGIA PRO VITA SUA, being a History of his Religious Opinions. By JOHN HENRY CARDINAL NEWMAN. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Pocket Edition. Fcap. 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d. *net;* leather, 3s. 6d. *net.*

Popular Edition, 8vo, paper covers, 6d. *net.*

The "Pocket" Edition and the "Popular" Edition of this book contain a letter, hitherto unpublished, written by Cardinal Newman to Canon Flanagan in 1857, which may be said to contain in embryo the "Apologia" itself.

THE LIFE OF JOHN HENRY CARDINAL NEWMAN. Based on his Private Journals and Correspondence. By WILFRID WARD. With 2 Portraits. 2 vols. 8vo. 12s. 6d. *net.*

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF CARDINAL WISEMAN. By WILFRID WARD. With 3 Portraits. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 10s. *net.*

WILLIAM GEORGE WARD AND THE CATHOLIC REVIVAL. By WILFRID WARD. With a New Preface, Portrait and Facsimile. 8vo. 6s. 6d. *net.*

TEN PERSONAL STUDIES. By WILFRID WARD. With 10 Portraits. 8vo. 10s. 6d. *net.*

CONTENTS.—Arthur James Balfour—Three Notable Editors: Delane, Hutton, Knowles—Some Characteristics of Henry Sidgwick—Robert, Earl of Lytton—Father Ignatius Ryder—Sir M. E. Grant Duff's Diaries—Leo XIII.—The Genius of Cardinal Wiseman—John Henry Newman—Newman and Manning—Appendix

ESSAYS ON MEN AND MATTERS. By WILFRID WARD. 8vo.

CONTENTS.—Disraeli—Lord Cromer on Disraeli—G. K. Chesterton as a Prophet—John Stuart Mill—Tennyson at Freshwater—Cardinal Vaughan—The Sensitiveness of Cardinal Newman—Papers read before the Synthetic Society, and other Essays.

ESSAYS. By the Rev. FATHER IGNATIUS DUDLEY RYDER. Edited by FRANCIS BACCHUS, of the Oratory, Birmingham. With Frontispiece. 8vo. 9s. *net.*

For Contents see page 14.

Biography, etc.—*continued.*

LIVES OF THE ENGLISH MARTYRS.

First Series. THE MARTYRS DECLARED BLESSED BY POPE LEO XIII. Edited by DOM BEDE CAMM, O.S.B. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. *net* each.

Vol. I. MARTYRS UNDER KING HENRY VIII. (1535-1545).
Vol. II. MARTYRS UNDER QUEEN ELIZABETH (1570-1583).

Second Series. THE MARTYRS DECLARED VENERABLE. Edited by EDWIN H. BURTON, D.D., and JOHN H. POLLEN, S.J.

Vol. I 1583-1588. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. *net.*

THE THREE SISTERS OF LORD RUSSELL OF KILLOWEN AND THEIR CONVENT LIFE. By the Rev. MATTHEW RUSSELL, S.J. With 5 Illustrations. 8vo. 6s. *net.*

UNSEEN FRIENDS. By Mrs. WILLIAM O'BRIEN. With a Photogravure Portrait of Nano Nagle, Foundress of the Presentation Order. 8vo. 6s. 6d. *net.*

For Contents see page 14.

AUBREY DE VERE: a Memoir based on his unpublished Diaries and Correspondence. By WILFRID WARD. With Two Photogravure Portraits and 2 other Illustrations. 8vo. 14s. *net.*

THE HISTORY OF ST. CATHERINE OF SIENA AND HER COMPANIONS. With a Translation of her Treatise on Consummate Perfection. By AUGUSTA THEODOSIA DRANE. With 10 Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo. 15s.

A MEMOIR OF MOTHER FRANCIS RAPHAEL, O.S.D. (AUGUSTA THEODOSIA DRANE), sometime Prioress Provincial of the Congregation of Dominican Sisters of St. Catherine of Siena, Stone. With some of her Spiritual Notes and Letters. Edited by the Rev. Father BERTRAND WILBERFORCE, O.P. With portrait. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

LIFE OF THE MARQUISE DE LA ROCHE-JAQUELEIN, THE HEROINE OF LA VENDÉE. By the Hon. Mrs. MAXWELL SCOTT (of Abbotsford). With 8 Illustrations and a Map. 8vo. 7s. 6d. *net.*

LIFE OF ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI. By Father CUTHBERT, O.S.F.C. With 13 Illustrations. 8vo. 12s. 6d. *net.*

SAINT FRANCIS OF ASSISI: a Biography. By JOHANNES JÖRGENSEN. Translated by T. O'CONOR SLOANE. With 5 Illustrations. 8vo. 12s. 6d. *net.*

THE LIFE AND LEGEND OF THE LADY SAINT CLARE: Translated from the French version (1563) of Brother Francis du Puis. By Mrs. REGINALD BALFOUR. With an Introduction by Father CUTHBERT, O.S.F.C., and 24 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. Gilt top. 4s. 6d. *net.*

Biography, etc.—*continued.*

LIFE OF ST. ELIZABETH OF HUNGARY, DUCHESS OF THURINGIA. By the COUNT DE MONTALEMBERT, Peer of France, Member of the French Academy. Translated by FRANCIS DEMING HOYT. Large Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d. *net.*

LIFE OF THE VISCOUNTESS DE BONNAULT D'HOUET, Foundress of the Society of the Faithful Companions of Jesus, 1781-1858. By the Rev. FATHER STANISLAUS, F.M., Capuchin of the Province of Paris. Translated from the French by one of her daughters. With Prefaces by His Eminence CARDINAL BOURNE, Archbishop of Westminster; and by the Right Rev. ABBOT GASQUET, President of the English Benedictines. With Photogravure Portrait and 57 Illustrations. 8vo. Quarter bound, gilt top, 7s. 6d. *net;* Superior binding, full leather, gilt edges, 21s. *net.*

HISTORY OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL, Founder of the Congregation of the Mission (Vincentians), and of the Sisters of Charity. By Monseigneur BOUGAUD, Bishop of Laval. Translated from the Second French Edition by the Rev. JOSEPH BRADY, C.M. With an Introduction by His Eminence CARDINAL VAUGHAN, late Archbishop of Westminster. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d. *net.*

IN ST. DOMINIC'S COUNTRY. By C. M. ANTONY. Edited with a Preface by the Rev. T. M. SCHWERTNER, O.P., S.T.L. With 50 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 6s. *net.*

The record of a pilgrimage to the towns and villages of Southern France known to have been visited by Saint Dominic, between 1205-1219, with the account of his Apostolate there, and the founding of his First and Second Orders. A sketch of the Albigensian Crusade is also given. The book is illustrated with over forty photographs, more than half of which have been expressly taken for the purpose, and contains two sketch maps. It may on this account fairly lay claim to be—at least for these fourteen important years—a Picture Book of Saint Dominic.

The Beginnings of the Church.

A Series of Histories of the First Century.

By the Abbé CONSTANT FOUARD, Honorary Cathedral Canon Professor of the Faculty of Theology at Rouen, etc., etc.

THE CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD. A Life of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. With an Introduction by CARDINAL MANNING. With 3 Maps. Two vols. Crown 8vo. 14s.

Popular Edition. 8vo. Cloth, 1s. *net.* Paper Covers, 6d. *net.*

ST. PETER AND THE FIRST YEARS OF CHRISTIANITY. With 3 Maps. Crown 8vo. 9s.

ST. PAUL AND HIS MISSIONS. With 2 Maps. Crown 8vo. 9s.

Popular Edition. 8vo. Cloth, 1s. *net.* Paper Covers, 6d. *net.*

THE LAST YEARS OF ST. PAUL. With 5 Maps and Plans. Crown 8vo. 9s.

ST. JOHN AND THE CLOSE OF THE APOSTOLIC AGE. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Lives of the Friar Saints.

Editors for the Franciscan Lives :
The Very Rev. Fr. OSMUND COONEY, O.F.M., Provincial, and C. M. ANTONY.

Editors for the Dominican Lives :
The Rev. Fr. BEDE JARRETT, O.P., and C. M. ANTONY.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth, 1s. 6d. per volume ; Leather, 2s. 6d. *net* per volume.

THE HOLY FATHER has expressed through the Very Rev. Fr. Thomas Esser, O.P., Secretary of the Congregation of the Index, his great pleasure and satisfaction that the series has been undertaken, and wishes it every success. He bestows "most affectionately" His Apostolic Blessing upon the Editors, Writers, and Readers of the whole series.

The Master-General of the Dominicans, at Rome, in sending his blessing to the writers and readers of the series, says : " The Lives should teach their readers not only to know the Saints, but also to imitate them ".

The Minister-General of the Franciscans sends his blessing and best wishes for the success of the series.

The series, which has received the warm approval of the authorities of both Orders in England, Ireland, and America, is earnestly recommended to Tertiaries, and to the Catholic public generally.

Fr. OSMUND COONEY, O.F.M.,
Fr. BEDE JARRETT, O.P.,
C. M. ANTONY,
Editors.

DOMINICAN.

ST. THOMAS AQUINAS.

Of the Order of Preachers (1225-1274). A Biographical Study of the Angelic Doctor. By Fr. PLACID CONWAY, O.P. With 5 Illustrations.

ST. VINCENT FERRER,

O.P. By Fr. STANISLAUS HOGAN, O.P. With 4 Illustrations.

ST. PIUS V. Pope of the

Holy Rosary. By C. M. ANTONY. With Preface by the Very Rev. Monsignor BENSON. With 4 Illustrations.

FRANCISCAN.

ST. BONAVENTURE.

The Seraphic Doctor. Minister General of the Franciscan Order, Cardinal Bishop of Albano. By Fr. LAURENCE COSTELLOE, O.F.M. With 6 Illustrations.

ST. ANTONY OF PADUA.

The Miracle Worker (1195-1231). By C. M. ANTONY. With 4 Illustrations.

ST. JOHN CAPISTRAN.

By Fr. VINCENT FITZGERALD, O.F.M. With 4 Illustrations.

Belles Lettres.

LEVIA PONDERA: An Essay Book. By JOHN AYSCOUGH. Crown 8vo. 5s. *net.*

CONTENTS.—Sir Walter—A Scamp's Probation—"The Entail": an Appreciation—The Leddy o' Grippy—Fickle Fame—King's Servants—An Essay on Essayists—Parallels—Loyalists and Patriots—Time's Reprisals—Cause and Cure—The Shoe and the Foot—Of Old Ways—Scientiae Inimici—Laxity or Sanctity—Press and Public—On Book Buying—Of Dislike of Books—Atmosphere and Antidote—On Sitting Still—Diabolica Trees—Footnotes—"This Public Conscience"—State and Conscience—Empire Day—Duty and Discipline—On Decadence—Messrs. Hooligan and Turveydrop—Two Pessimisms—Peace and Peoples—Dress and Clothing—Of Cathedrals—Of Stone Sermons and White Elephants—An Admiration Note—Why Norwich?—Cold Porridge—Of Weaker Brethren—The Roman Road—Of Saints and Worthies—Of Great Age—Mare's Nests and Much Boasting—Of Lapse and Losses.

IN GOD'S NURSERY. By C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. *net.*

These are sketches of children's lives as they have been lived at different times, and in different parts of God's great Nursery, the world. They are touched in with a light hand, and thus justify the quotation that "The Streets of the City shall be full of Boys and Girls playing in the Streets thereof".

HAPPINESS AND BEAUTY. By the Right Rev. JOHN S. VAUGHAN, D.D., Bishop of Sebastopolis. Crown 8vo. 1s. 6d. *net.*

CONTENTS.—The Hunger of the Heart—Certain Leading Principles—Various Degrees of Happiness—Man's Magnificent Destiny—Beauty: Visible and Invisible.

ESSAYS. By the Rev. FATHER IGNATIUS DUDLEY RYDER. Edited by FRANCIS BACCHUS, of the Oratory, Birmingham. With Frontispiece. 8vo. 9s. *net.*

CONTENTS.—A Jesuit Reformer and Poet: Frederick Spee—Revelations of the After-World—Savonarola—M. Emery, Superior of St. Sulpice, 1789-1811—Auricular Confession—The Pope and the Anglican Archbishops—Ritualism, Roman Catholicism, and Converts—On Certain Ecclesiastical Miracles—The Ethics of War—The Passions of the Past—Some Memories of a Jail Chaplain—Purcell's Life of Cardinal Manning.

APPENDIX.—Some Notes on Ryder's Controversy with Ward.

UNSEEN FRIENDS. By Mrs. WILLIAM O'BRIEN. With a Photogravure Portrait of Nano Nagle, Foundress of the Presentation Order. 8vo. 6s. 6d. *net.*

CONTENTS.—Mother Margaret Mary Hallahan—A Novelist of the last Century: Mrs. Oliphant—Nano Nagle—Charlotte Brontë at Home—Mary Aikenhead, Foundress of the Irish Sisters of Charity—Felicia Skene—Catharine McAuley, Foundress of the Sisters of Mercy—Jean Ingelow—Mother Frances Raphael Drane—Eugénie de Guérin—Emilie d'Oultrement—Pauline de la Ferronays and her Family—A French Heroine in China: Hélène de Jaurias, Sister of Charity—Christina Rossetti—Marie Antoniette Fage.

A GUIDE TO BOOKS ON IRELAND. By STEPHEN J. BROWN, S.J. 3 vols. Crown 8vo.

Vol. I. PROSE, LITERATURE, POETRY, MUSIC, and PLAYS. 6s. *net.*

Vols. II. and III. *In preparation.*

For Spiritual Reading.

THE SERMON OF THE SEA, and Other Studies. By the Rev. ROBERT KANE, S.J. Crown 8vo. 5s. *net.*

THE PLAIN GOLD RING. By the Rev. ROBERT KANE, S.J. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. *net.*

GOOD FRIDAY TO EASTER SUNDAY. By the Rev. ROBERT KANE, S.J. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. *net.*

SERMONS AND HOMILIES. By the Rev. EDMUND ENGLISH, Canon of Westminster Cathedral and Missionary Rector of St. James's, Twickenham. Crown 8vo. 4s. *net.*

AT HOME WITH GOD: Priedieu Papers on Spiritual Subjects. By the Rev. MATTHEW RUSSELL, S.J. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. *net.*

AMONG THE BLESSED: Loving Thoughts about Favourite Saints. By the Rev. MATTHEW RUSSELL, S.J. With 8 full-page Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. *net.*

THE PARADOXES OF CATHOLICISM. Sermons preached in Rome, Easter, 1913. By the Very Rev. Monsignor ROBERT HUGH BENSON. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. *net.*

CHRIST IN THE CHURCH: A Volume of Religious Essays. By the Very Rev. Monsignor ROBERT HUGH BENSON. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. *net.*

THE FRIENDSHIP OF CHRIST: Sermons. By the Very Rev. Monsignor ROBERT HUGH BENSON. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. *net.*

SELF-KNOWLEDGE AND SELF-DISCIPLINE. By the Rev. B. W. MATURIN. Crown 8vo. 5s. *net.*

LAWS OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE. By the Rev. B. W. MATURIN. Crown 8vo. 5s. *net.*

SPIRITUAL GLEANINGS FOR MARIAN SODALISTS. By MADAME CECILIA, Religious of St. Andrew's Convent, Streatham, London, S.W. With a Frontispiece. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. *net.*

THE INNER LIFE OF THE SOUL. Short Spiritual Messages for the Ecclesiastical Year. By S. L. EMERY. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d. *net.*

THESAURUS FIDELIUM: a Manual for those who desire to lead Prayerful Lives in the World. Compiled by a CARMELITE TERTIARY (H. M. K.). Fcap 8vo.

OUR LADY IN THE CHURCH, and other Essays. By M. NESBITT. With a Preface by the Right Rev. Dr. CASARTELLI, Bishop of Salford. With a Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d. *net.*

A collection of essays, mainly historical or antiquarian in character. The papers deal with the life and work of the Catholic Church, and with various manners, customs, and religious observances in mediæval times.

For Young People.

THE HOUSE AND TABLE OF GOD: a Book for His Children Young and Old. By the Rev. WILLIAM ROCHE, S.J. With 24 Drawings by T. BAINES. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 2s. 6d. *net*; Vegetable Vellum, 3s. 6d. *net*.

This book is primarily intended to guide the thoughts of children at an age when they begin to wonder, and to argue secretly within themselves about questions of life and religion; but is equally suited to the open-minded of every age. It offers a consecutive series of readings calculated to deepen religious thought and feeling on essential truth.

A CHILD'S RULE OF LIFE. By the Very Rev. Monsignor ROBERT HUGH BENSON. Printed in Red and Black and Illustrated by GABRIEL PIPPET. 4to. Paper Covers, 1s. *net*; Cloth, 2s. *net*.

OLD TESTAMENT RHYMES. By the Very Rev. Monsignor ROBERT HUGH BENSON. Printed in Red and Black, and Illustrated by GABRIEL PIPPET. 4to. Paper Covers, 1s. *net;* Cloth, 2s. *net*.

A LIFE OF CHRIST FOR CHILDREN. With 20 Illustrations, reproduced chiefly from the Old Masters. With Preface by His Eminence CARDINAL GIBBONS. Large Crown 8vo. 4s. *net*.

BIBLE STORIES TOLD TO "TODDLES". By Mrs. HERMANN BOSCH. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. *net*.

WHEN "TODDLES" WAS SEVEN: A Sequel to "Bible Stories told to 'Toddles'". By Mrs. HERMANN BOSCH. Crown 8vo. 3s. *net*.

THE GOOD SHEPHERD AND HIS LITTLE LAMBS. By Mrs. HERMANN BOSCH. With a Frontispiece. Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d. *net*.

STORIES ON THE ROSARY. By LOUISE EMILY DOBRÉE. Parts I., II., III. Crown 8vo. 1s. 6d. each.

OLD RHYMES WITH NEW TUNES. Composed by RICHARD RUNCIMAN TERRY, Mus. Doc., F.R.C.O., Organist and Director of the Choir at Westminster Cathedral. With Illustrations by GABRIEL PIPPET. 4to. 2s. 6d. *net*.

A MYSTERY PLAY IN HONOUR OF THE NATIVITY OF OUR LORD. By the Very Rev. Monsignor ROBERT HUGH BENSON. With 14 Illustrations by GABRIEL PIPPET; Appendices, and Stage Directions. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. *net*.
Acting Edition. 6d. *net*.

THE COST OF A CROWN: a Story of Douay and Durham. A Sacred Drama in Three Acts. By the Very Rev. Monsignor ROBERT HUGH BENSON. With 9 Illustrations by GABRIEL PIPPET. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. *net*.

THE MAID OF ORLEANS. By the Very Rev. Monsignor ROBERT HUGH BENSON. With 14 Illustrations by GABRIEL PIPPET. Crown 8vo. 3s. *net*.
Acting Edition. 6d. *net*.

Poetry and Romance.

WELSH POETRY (OLD AND NEW) IN ENGLISH VERSE. By ALFRED PERCEVAL GRAVES, M.A. ("Canwr Cilarné"). Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

BALLADS OF IRISH CHIVALRY. By ROBERT DWYER JOYCE, M.D. Edited, with Annotations, by his brother, P. W. JOYCE, LL.D. With Portrait of the Author and 3 Illustrations. 8vo. Cloth gilt, 2s. *net.* Paper Covers, 1s. *net.*

OLD CELTIC ROMANCES. Twelve of the most beautiful of the Ancient Irish Romantic Tales. Translated from the Gaelic. By P. W. JOYCE, LL.D., M.R.I.A. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

ANCIENT IRISH MUSIC. Containing One Hundred Airs never before published, and a number of Popular Songs. Collected and Edited by P. W. JOYCE, LL.D., M.R.I.A. 4to. Paper wrappers, 1s. 6d. Cloth, 3s.

OLD IRISH FOLK MUSIC AND SONGS: a collection of 842 Irish Airs and Songs hitherto unpublished. Edited by P. W. JOYCE, LL.D., M.R.I.A., with Annotations, for the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland. Medium 8vo. 10s. 6d. *net.*

IRISH PEASANT SONGS. In the English Language; the words set to the proper Old Irish Airs. Collected and Edited by P. W. JOYCE, LL.D., M.R.I.A. Crown 8vo. Paper Covers, 6d. *net.*

HISTORICAL BALLAD POETRY OF IRELAND. Arranged by M. J. BROWN. With an Introduction by STEPHEN J. BROWN, S.J. With 8 Portraits. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Fiction.

GRACECHURCH. By JOHN AYSCOUGH. Crown 8vo. 6s.

A READER'S GUIDE TO IRISH FICTION. By STEPHEN J. BROWN, S.J. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. *net.*

THE FUGITIVES. By MARGARET FLETCHER. Crown 8vo. 6s.

CATHERINE SIDNEY. By FRANCIS DEMING HOYT. Crown 8vo. 6s.

Novels by Mrs. Wilfrid Ward.

ONE POOR SCRUPLE. Crown 8vo. 6s.

OUT OF DUE TIME. Crown 8vo. 6s.

GREAT POSSESSIONS. Crown 8vo. 6s.

THE LIGHT BEHIND. Crown 8vo. 6s.

THE JOB SECRETARY. An Impression. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Novels by M. E. Francis (Mrs. Francis Blundell).

CHRISTIAN THAL. With Musical Chapter Headings. Crown 8vo. 6s.

DORSET DEAR: Idylls of Country Life. Crown 8vo. 6s.

LYCHGATE HALL: a Romance. Crown 8vo. 6s.

THE MANOR FARM. With Frontispiece by Claude C. du Pré Cooper. Crown 8vo. 6s.

FIANDER'S WIDOW. Crown 8vo. 6s.

YEOMAN FLEETWOOD. Crown 8vo. 3s. *net.*

Works by the Very Rev. Canon Sheehan, D.D.

MIRIAM LUCAS. A Story of Irish Life. Crown 8vo. 6s.

THE QUEEN'S FILLET. A Tale of the French Revolution. Crown 8vo. 6s.

LISHEEN; or, The Test of the Spirits. A Novel. Cr. 8vo. 6s.

LUKE DELMEGE. A Novel. Crown 8vo. 6s.

GLENANAAR: a Story of Irish Life. Crown 8vo. 6s.

THE BLINDNESS OF DR. GRAY; or, the Final Law: a Novel of Clerical Life. Crown 8vo. 6s.

"LOST ANGEL OF A RUINED PARADISE": a Drama of Modern Life. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

THE INTELLECTUALS: An Experiment in Irish Club Life. 8vo. 6s.

PARERGA: being a Companion Volume to "Under the Cedars and the Stars". Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. *net.*

EARLY ESSAYS AND LECTURES. Crown 8vo. 6s. *net.*

CONTENTS.

Essays.

Religious Instruction in Intermediate Schools—In a Dublin Art Gallery—Emerson—Free-Thought in America—German Universities (Three Essays)—German and Gallic Muses—Augustinian Literature—The Poetry of Matthew Arnold—Recent Works on St. Augustine—Aubrey de Vere (a Study).

Lectures.

Irish Youth and High Ideals—The Two Civilisations—The Golden Jubilee of O'Connell's Death—Our Personal and Social Responsibilities—The Study of Mental Science—Certain Elements of Character—The Limitations and Possibilities of Catholic Literature.

Education.

A HISTORY OF ENGLAND FOR CATHOLIC SCHOOLS. By E. WYATT-DAVIES, M.A. With 14 Maps. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

OUTLINES OF BRITISH HISTORY. By E. WYATT-DAVIES, M.A. With 85 Illustrations and 13 Maps. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

A CHILD'S HISTORY OF IRELAND. From the Earliest Times to the Death of O'Connell. By P. W. JOYCE, LL.D., M.R.I.A. With specially constructed Map and 160 Illustrations, including Facsimile in Full Colours of an Illuminated Page of the Gospel Book of MacDurnan, A.D. 850. Fcp. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

OUTLINES OF THE HISTORY OF IRELAND. From the Earliest Times to 1905. By P. W. JOYCE, LL.D., M.R.I.A. Fcp. 8vo. 9d.

A READING BOOK IN IRISH HISTORY. By P. W. JOYCE, LL.D., M.R.I.A. With 45 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 1s. 6d.

A HISTORY OF IRELAND FOR AUSTRALIAN CATHOLIC SCHOOLS. From the Earliest Times to the Death of O'Connell. By P. W. JOYCE, LL.D., M.R.I.A. With specially constructed Map and 160 Illustrations, including Facsimile in Full Colours of an Illuminated Page of the Gospel Book of MacDurnan, A.D. 850. Fcap. 8vo. 2s.

The authorised Irish History for Catholic Schools and Colleges throughout Australasia.

AN EXPERIMENT IN HISTORY TEACHING. By EDWARD ROCKLIFF, S.J. With 3 Coloured Charts. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. *net.*

HISTORICAL ATLAS OF INDIA, for the Use of High Schools, Colleges and Private Students. By CHARLES JOPPEN, S.J. 29 Maps in Colours. Post 4to. 2s. 6d.

GRAMMAR LESSONS. By the PRINCIPAL OF ST. MARY'S HALL, Liverpool. Crown 8vo. 2s.

THE CLASS TEACHING OF ENGLISH COMPOSITION. By the PRINCIPAL OF ST. MARY'S HALL, Liverpool. Crown 8vo. 2s.

ENGLISH AS WE SPEAK IT IN IRELAND. By P. W. JOYCE, LL.D., M.R.I.A. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. *net.*

A GRAMMAR OF THE IRISH LANGUAGE. By P. W. JOYCE, LL.D., M.R.I.A. Fcp. 8vo. 1s.

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF CLASSICAL TEACHING. By the Rev. T. CORCORAN, S.J. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. *net.*

Education—*continued.*

HANDBOOK OF HOMERIC STUDY. By HENRY BROWNE, S.J., M.A., New College, Oxford. With 22 Plates. Crown 8vo. 6s. *net.*

HANDBOOK OF GREEK COMPOSITION. With Exercises for Junior and Middle Classes. By HENRY BROWNE, S.J., M.A. Crown 8vo. 3s. *net.*

Key for the Use of Masters only, 5s. 2d. *net.*

HANDBOOK OF LATIN COMPOSITION. With Exercises. By HENRY BROWNE, S.J., M.A. Crown 8vo. 3s. *net.*

Key for the Use of Masters only, 5s. 2d. *net.*

SCIENCE OF EDUCATION. By T. P. KEATING, B.A., L.C.P. With an Introduction by Rev. T. A. FINLAY, M.A., National University, Dublin. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. *net.*

THE EDUCATION OF CATHOLIC GIRLS. By JANET ERSKINE STUART. With a Preface by the CARDINAL ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. *net.*

THE TEACHER'S COMPANION. By Brother DE SALES, M.A. Diplomate in Education, etc. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. *net.*

**** *A book on School Methods, with blank pages for the insertion of the personal experiences of the teacher.*

A HANDBOOK OF SCHOOL MANAGEMENT AND METHODS OF TEACHING. By P. W. JOYCE, LL.D., M.R.I.A. Fcp. 3s. 6d.

QUICK AND DEAD? To Teachers. By Two of Them. Crown 8vo. 1s. 6d.

THE FOUNTAIN OF LIFE. To Catholic Teachers. By One of the Authors of "Quick and Dead". Crown 8vo. 1s. *net.*

PRINCIPLES OF LOGIC. By G. H. JOYCE, S.J., M.A., Oxford, Professor of Logic at Stonyhurst. 8vo. 6s. 6d. *net.*

INTRODUCTORY PHILOSOPHY: a Textbook for Colleges and High Schools. By CHARLES A. DUBRAY, S.M., Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy at the Marist College, Washington, D.C. With a Preface by Professor E. D. PACE, of the Catholic University, Washington, D.C. 8vo. 10s. 6d. *net.*

FIVE CENTURIES OF ENGLISH POETRY. From Chaucer to De Vere. Representative Selections with Notes and Remarks on the Art of Reading Verse Aloud. By the Rev. GEORGE O'NEILL, S.J., M.A., Professor of English, University College, Dublin. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. *net.*

Cardinal Newman's Works.

1. SERMONS.

PAROCHIAL AND PLAIN SERMONS. Edited by the Rev. W. J. COPELAND, B.D. 8 vols. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each.

The first six volumes are reprinted from the six volumes of *Parochial Sermons*. first published in 1834, 1835, 1836, 1838, 1840, and 1842 respectively; the seventh and eighth formed the fifth volume of **Plain Sermons by Contributors to the Tracts for the Times**, originally published in 1843.

The fame of these sermons has been celebrated by Froude, Principal Shairp, James Mozley, Dean Church, and others. "The Tracts," writes the last-named in his *Oxford Movement*, "were not the most powerful instruments in drawing sympathy to the movement. None but those who heard them can adequately estimate the effect of Mr. Newman's four o'clock sermons at St. Mary's. The world knows them . . . but it hardly realizes that without these sermons the movement might never have gone on. . . . While men were reading and talking about the Tracts, they were hearing the sermons; and in the sermons they heard the living meaning, and reason, and bearing of the Tracts. . . . The sermons created a moral atmosphere, in which men judged the questions in debate." The *Parochial Sermons* fell out of print between 1845 and 1868, at which latter date they were republished by Newman's former curate at St. Mary's, Mr. Copeland. The success of this re-issue was a striking testimony to the degree to which Newman had recovered his popularity and prestige by the Apologia. He recorded in his private journal that in six months 3500 copies of the first volume were sold.

Ward's *Life of Newman*, vol. ii. p. 241.

SELECTION, ADAPTED TO THE SEASONS OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL YEAR, from the "Parochial and Plain Sermons". Edited by the Rev. W. J. COPELAND, B.D. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

This volume consisting of fifty-four sermons was first published in 1878.

CONTENTS:—*Advent:* Self-denial the Test of Religious Earnestness—Divine Calls—The Ventures of Faith—Watching. *Christmas Day:* Religious Joy. *New Year's Sunday:* The Lapse of Time—*Epiphany:* Remembrance of Past Mercies—Equanimity—The Immortality of the Soul—Christian Manhood—Sincerity and Hypocrisy—Christian Sympathy. *Septuagesima:* Present Blessings. *Sexagesima:* Endurance, the Christian's Portion. *Quinquagesima:* Love, the One Thing Needful. *Lent:* The Individuality of the Soul—Life, the Season of Repentance—Bodily Suffering—Tears of Christ at the Grave of Lazarus—Christ's Privations, a Meditation for Christians—The Cross of Christ the Measure of the World. *Good Friday:* The Crucifixion. *Easter Day* Keeping Fast and Festival. *Easter Tide:* Witnesses of the Resurrection—A Particular Providence as revealed in the Gospel—Christ Manifested in Remembrance—The Invisible World—Waiting for Christ. *Ascension:* Warfare the Condition of Victory. *Sunday after Ascension:* Rising with Christ. *Whitsun Day:* The Weapons of Saints. *Trinity Sunday:* The Mysteriousness of Our Present Being. *Sundays after Trinity:* Holiness Necessary for Future Blessedness—The Religious Use of Excited Feelings—The Self-wise Inquirer—Scripture a Record of Human Sorrow—The Danger of Riches—Obedience without Love, as instanced in the Character of Balaam—Moral Consequences of Single Sins—The Greatness and Littleness of Human Life—Moral Effects of Communion with God—The Thought of God the Stay of the Soul—The Power of the Will—The Gospel Palaces—Religion a Weariness to the Natural Man—The World our Enemy—The Praise of Men—Religion Pleasant to the Religious—Mental Prayer—Curiosity a Temptation to Sin—Miracles no Remedy for Unbelief—Jeremiah, a Lesson for the Disappointed—The Shepherd of our Souls—Doing Glory to God in Pursuits of the World.

Cardinal Newman's Works—*continued.*

SERMONS BEARING UPON SUBJECTS OF THE DAY. Edited by the Rev. W. J. COPELAND, B.D. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

This volume was first published in 1843, and republished by Mr. Copeland in 1869. This collection contains the celebrated sermons "Wisdom and Innocence," and "The Parting of Friends". Mr. Copeland appended to it very important chronological lists, giving the dates at which the sermons contained in it and the eight volumes of *Parochial and Plain Sermons* were first delivered.

CONTENTS.—The Work of the Christian—Saintliness not Forfeited by the Penitent—Our Lord's Last Supper and His First—Dangers to the Penitent—The Three Offices of Christ—Faith and Experience—Faith unto the World—The Church and the World—Indulgence in Religious Privileges—Connection between Personal and Public Improvement—Christian Nobleness—Joshua a Type of Christ and His Followers—Elisha a Type of Christ and His Followers—The Christian Church a Continuation of the Jewish—The Principles of Continuity between the Jewish and Christian Churches—The Christian Church an Imperial Power—Sanctity the Token of the Christian Empire—Condition of the Members of the Christian Empire—The Apostolic Christian—Wisdom and Innocence—Invisible Presence of Christ—Outward and Inward Notes of the Church—Grounds for Steadfastness in our Religious Profession—Elijah the Prophet of the Latter Days—Feasting in Captivity—The Parting of Friends.

FIFTEEN SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, between 1826 and 1843. Cr. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

The first edition of these sermons was published in 1843; the second in 1844. The original title was "Sermons, chiefly on the Theory of Religious Belief, Preached," etc. The third edition was published in 1870, with (1) a new Preface, in which the author explains, *inter alia*, the sense in which he had used the term "Reason" in the sermons; and (2) notes "to draw attention to certain faults which are to be found in them, either of thought or language, and, as far as possible, to set these right". This preface and the notes are of great value to students of the Grammar of Assent. Among the sermons contained in this volume is the celebrated one delivered in 1843 on "The Theory of Developments in Religious Doctrine".

CONTENTS.—The Philosophical Temper, first enjoined by the Gospel—The Influence of Natural and Revealed Religion respectively—Evangelical Sanctity the Perfection of Natural Virtue—The Usurpations of Reason—Personal Influence, the Means of Propagating the Truth—On Justice as a Principle of Divine Governance—Contest between Faith and Sight—Human Responsibility, as independent of Circumstances—Wilfulness, the Sin of Saul—Faith and Reason, contrasted as Habits of Mind—The Nature of Faith in Relation to Reason—Love, the Safeguard of Faith against Superstition—Implicit and Explicit Reason—Wisdom, as contrasted with Faith and with Bigotry—The Theory of Developments in Religious Doctrine.

DISCOURSES TO MIXED CONGREGATIONS. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

First published in 1849.

"These sermons have a definite tone and genius of their own . . . and though they have not to me quite the delicate charm of the reserve, and I might almost say the shy passion, of his Oxford sermons, they represent the full-blown blossom of his genius, while the former shows it only in the bud. . . . The extraordinary wealth of detail with which Newman conceives and realises the various sins and miseries of the human lot has, perhaps, never been illustrated in all his writings with so much force as in the wonderful sixteenth sermon on 'The Mental Sufferings of our Lord in His Passion,'" etc.
The late Mr. R. H. HUTTON.

CONTENTS.—The Salvation of the Hearer the Motive of the Preacher—Neglect of Divine Calls and Warnings—Men, not Angels, the Priests of the Gospel—Purity and Love—Saintliness the Standard of Christian Principle—God's Will the End of Life—Perseverance in Grace—Nature and Grace—Illuminating Grace—Faith and Private Judgment—Faith and Doubt—Prospects of the Catholic Missioner—Mysteries of Nature and of Grace—The Mystery of Divine Condescension—The Infinitude of the Divine Attributes—Mental Sufferings of our Lord in His Passion—The Glories of Mary for the Sake of Her Son—On the Fitness of the Glories of Mary.

Cardinal Newman's Works—*continued.*

SERMONS PREACHED ON VARIOUS OCCASIONS. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

This volume, which was first published in 1857, consists of eight sermons preached before the Catholic University of Ireland in 1856-1857, and seven sermons delivered on different occasions between 1850 and 1872. Among the latter are the celebrated "Second Spring" and "The Pope and the Revolution" preached 1850-1872 at St. Chad's, the Oratory, Oscott, and Farm Street, London, with Notes.

CONTENTS.—Intellect the Instrument of Religious Training—The Religion of the Pharisee—The Religion of Mankind—Waiting for Christ—The Secret Power of Divine Grace—Dispositions for Faith—Omnipotence in Bonds—St. Paul's Characteristic Gift—St. Paul's Gift of Sympathy—Christ upon the Waters—The Second Spring—Order, the Witness and Instrument of Unity—The Mission of St. Philip Neri—The Tree beside the Waters—In the World but not of the World—The Pope and the Revolution—Notes.

2. TREATISES.

LECTURES ON THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

These Lectures were first published in 1838. They were reprinted in 1874 with an "Advertisement to the Third Edition" and some additional notes.

CONTENTS.—Faith considered as the Instrumental Cause of Justification—Love considered as the Formal Cause of Justification—Primary Sense of the term "Justification"—Secondary Senses of the term "Justification"—Misuse of the term "Just" or "Righteous"—The Gift of Righteousness—The Characteristics of the Gift of Righteousness—Righteousness viewed as a Gift and as a Quality—Righteousness the Fruit of our Lord's Resurrection—The Office of Justifying Faith—The Nature of Justifying Faith—Faith viewed relatively to Rites and Works—On Preaching the Gospel—Appendix—On the Formal Cause of Justification.

AN ESSAY ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

"In this New Edition of the Essay, first published in 1845, various important alterations have been made in the arrangement of its separate parts, and some, not indeed in its matter, but in its text."—*Preface to Third Edition*, 1878.

THE IDEA OF A UNIVERSITY DEFINED AND ILLUSTRATED. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

I. In Nine Discourses delivered to the Catholics of Dublin.

II. In Occasional Lectures and Essays addressed to the members of the Catholic University.

Part I. was first published in 1852 under the title of *Discourses on the Scope and Nature of University Education, etc.*

CONTENTS.—I. Introductory—II. Theology a Branch of Knowledge—III. Bearing of Theology on other Knowledge—IV. Bearing of other Knowledge on Theology—V. Knowledge its own End—VI. Knowledge viewed in Relation to Learning—VII. Knowledge viewed in Relation to Professional Skill—VIII. Knowledge viewed in Relation to Religious Duty—IX. Duties of the Church towards Knowledge.

Part II. was first published in 1859 under the title of *Lectures and Essays on University Subjects.*

CONTENTS.—I. Christianity and Letters—II. Literature—III. Catholic Literature in the English Tongue—IV. Elementary Studies—V. A Form of Infidelity of the Day—VI. University Preaching—VII. Christianity and Physical Science—VIII. Christianity and Scientific Investigation—IX. Discipline of Mind—X. Christianity and Medical Science.

*** *Part I. is also issued separately as follows:—*

UNIVERSITY TEACHING CONSIDERED IN NINE DISCOURSES. With a Preface by the Rev. JOHN NORRIS. Fcp. 8vo. Cloth, Gilt Top, 2s. *net*. Leather, 3s. *net*.

Cardinal Newman's Works—*continued.*

AN ESSAY IN AID OF A GRAMMAR OF ASSENT.

Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

First published in 1870, with Notes at the end of the volume added to the later editions.

AN INDEXED SYNOPSIS OF CARDINAL NEWMAN'S "AN ESSAY IN AID OF A GRAMMAR OF ASSENT". By the Rev. JOHN J. TOOHEY, S.J. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

3. HISTORICAL.

HISTORICAL SKETCHES. Three vols. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each.

VOL. I.—The Turks in their Relation to Europe—Marcus Tullius Cicero—Apollonius of Tyana—Primitive Christianity.

The Essay on "The Turks in their Relation to Europe" was first published under the title of *Lectures on the History of the Turks by the Author of Loss and Gain*, in 1854. As is well known, Newman took what was then the unpopular side. The Czar was "attacking an infamous power, the enemy of God and Man". "Many things are possible; one is inconceivable—that the Turks should, as an existing nation, accept of modern civilisation; and in default of it, that they should be able to stand their ground amid the encroachments of Russia, the interested and contemptuous patronage of Europe, and the hatred of their subject populations."

Personal and Literary Character of Cicero. First published in 1824.

Apollonius of Tyana. First published in 1826.

Primitive Christianity.

I. What does St. Ambrose say about it?—II. What says Vincent of Lerins?—III. What says the History of Apollinaris?—IV. What say Jovinian and his companions?—V. What say the Apostolical Canons?

This series formed part of the original *Church of the Fathers* as it appeared in the *British Magazine* of 1833-36, and as it was published in 1840. "They were removed from subsequent Catholic editions, except the chapter on Apollinaris, as containing polemical matter, which had no interest for Catholic readers. Now [1872] they are republished under a separate title."

VOL. II.—The Church of the Fathers—St. Chrysostom—Theodoret—Mission of St. Benedict—Benedictine Schools.

The Church of the Fathers.

I. Trials of Basil—II. Labours of Basil—III. Basil and Gregory—IV. Rise and Fall of Gregory—V. Antony in Conflict—VI. Antony in Calm—VII. Augustine and the Vandals—VIII. Conversion of Augustine—IX. Demetrias—X. Martin and Maximus.

St. Chrysostom. Reprinted from the *Rambler*, 1859-60.

Trials of Theodoret. First published in 1873.

The Mission of St. Benedict. From the *Atlantis*, 1858.

The Benedictine Schools. From the *Atlantis*, 1859.

VOL. III.—Rise and Progress of Universities (originally published as "Office and Work of Universities")—Northmen and Normans in England and Ireland—Mediæval Oxford—Convocation of Canterbury.

Rise and Progress of Universities.

The following illustrations of the idea of a University originally appeared in 1854 in the columns of the Dublin *Catholic University Gazette*. In 1856 they were published in one volume under the title of *The Office and Work of Universities, etc.*

Northmen and Normans in England and Ireland. From the *Rambler* of 1859.

Mediaeval Oxford. From the *British Critic* of 1838.

The Convocation of the Province of Canterbury. From the *British Magazine* of 1834-35.

THE CHURCH OF THE FATHERS. Reprinted from "Historical Sketches". Vol. II. With a Preface by the Rev. JOHN NORRIS. Fcp. 8vo. Cloth, Gilt Top. 2s. *net.* Leather. 3s. *net.*

Cardinal Newman's Works—*continued.*

4. ESSAYS.

TWO ESSAYS ON MIRACLES. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

CONTENTS.—I. The Miracles of Scripture compared with those reported elsewhere as regards their nature, credibility, and evidence—II. The Miracles of Early Ecclesiastical History compared with those of Scripture as regards their nature, credibility, and evidence.

The former of these Essays was written for the *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*, 1825-26; the latter in 1842-43 as Preface to a Translation of a portion of Fleury's *Ecclesiastical History*. They were republished in 1870 with some additional notes.

DISCUSSIONS AND ARGUMENTS. Cr. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

1. How to accomplish it. 2. The Antichrist of the Fathers. 3. Scripture and the Creed. 4. Tamworth Reading-room. 5. Who's to Blame? 6. An Internal Argument for Christianity.

How to Accomplish It originally appeared in the *British Magazine* of 1830 under the title of "Home Thoughts Abroad". "The discussion on this Paper is carried on by two speculative Anglicans, who aim at giving vitality to their church, the one by uniting it to the Holy See, the other by developing a nineteenth century Anglo-Catholicism. The narrator sides on the whole with the latter of these."

The Patristical Idea of Antichrist. This was the Eighty-third Number of the *Tracts for the Times*, published in 1838.

Holy Scripture in its Relation to the Catholic Creed. This was the Eighty-fifth Number of the *Tracts for the Times*.

The Tamworth Reading Room. A series of seven letters, signed "Catholicus," first printed in the *Times* during February, 1841, and published as a pamphlet. They were provoked by addresses delivered by Lord Brougham at Glasgow and Sir Robert Peel at the opening of a Library and Reading Room at Tamworth, in which those distinguished statesmen exalted secular knowledge into the great instrument of moral improvement. They ran as follows: (1) Secular Knowledge in contrast with Religion. (2) Secular Knowledge not the principle of Moral Improvement. (3) Not a direct means of Moral Improvement. (4) Not the antecedent of Moral Improvement. (5) Not a principle of social unity. (6) Not a principle of action. (7) But without personal religion a temptation to unbelief.

Who's to Blame? A series of letters addressed to the *Catholic Standard* in 1855. There was at that time a great deal of blame attributed to the Government on account of its management of the Crimean War. Newman threw the blame on the British constitution, or rather on those who clamoured for a foreign war, for the conduct of which this constitution is singularly ill-adapted. The letters are a valuable study of the genius of the Anglo-Saxon race and the British constitution.

An Internal Argument for Christianity. A review, originally published in the Month of June, 1866, of *Ecce Homo*.

ESSAYS, CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL. Two vols., with Notes. Crown 8vo. 7s.

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.—I. Poetry with reference to Aristotle's Poetics. With Note—II. The Introduction of Rationalistic Principles into Revealed Religion. With Note—III. Apostolical Tradition. With Note—IV. The Fall of la Mennais. With Note—V. Palmer's View of Faith and Unity. With Note—VI. The Theology of St. Ignatius. With Note—VII. Prospects of the Anglican Church. With Note—VIII. The Anglo-American Church. With Note—IX. Selina Countess of Huntingdon. With Note.

CONTENTS OF VOL. II.—X. The Catholicity of the Anglican Church. With Note—XI. The Protestant View of Antichrist. With Note—XII. Milman's View of Christianity. With Note—XIII. The Reformation of the Eleventh Century. With Note—XIV. Private Judgment. With Note—XV. John Davison. With Note—XVI. John Keble. With Note.

The first Essay was written in 1828 for the *London Review*; the second in 1835 for the *Tracts for the Times*; the last in 1846 for the *Dublin Review*; the rest for the *British Critic* between 1837 and 1842. The original title of VII. was *Home Thoughts Abroad*. The "Notes" were written when the Essays were republished in 1871.

Cardinal Newman's Works—*continued.*

5. PATRISTIC.

THE ARIANS OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.

Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

First published in 1833. Republished, with an Appendix containing over seventy pages of additional matter, in 1871.

CONTENTS OF APPENDIX.—I. The Syrian School of Theology—II. The Early Doctrine of the Divine Genesis—III. The Confessions at Sirmium—IV. The Early use of *usia* and *hypostasis*—V. Orthodoxy of the Faithful during Arianism—VI. Chronology of the Councils—VII. Omissions in the Text of the Third Edition (1871).

(5) is a long extract from the article published in the *Rambler* of 1859, "On consulting the Faithful on Matters of Doctrine". In the fourth (1876) and subsequent editions of the *Arians* the author appended to the extract an explanation of a passage in the original article which had been seriously misunderstood in some quarters.

SELECT TREATISES OF ST. ATHANASIUS IN CONTROVERSY WITH THE ARIANS. Freely Translated.

Two vols. Crown 8vo. 7s.

First published in 1881. The first volume contains the "Treatises"; the second the notes alphabetically arranged so as to form a kind of theological lexicon to St. Athanasius's writings.

In 1842 Newman contributed to the Oxford Library of the Fathers two volumes entitled *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius in Controversy with the Arians*. This work was described by the late Canon Bright as ranking "among the richest treasures of English Patristic literature"; by the late Canon Liddon as "the most important contribution to the Library"; and in later prospectuses of the Library, after Newman's connection with it had ceased, as "the most important work published since Bishop Bull". The present edition differs from that of the Oxford Library in four important points, viz.: (1) the freedom of the translation; (2) the arrangement of the notes; (3) the omission of the fourth "Discourse against the Arians"; (4) the omission of some lengthy Dissertations. A Latin version of these last is included in *Tracts: Theological and Ecclesiastical*.

TRACTS: THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL.

Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

CONTENTS.—I. Dissertatiunculæ Quatuor Critico-Theologicæ [Rome 1847]—II. On the Text of the Epistles of St. Ignatius[1870]—III. Causes of the Rise and Success of Arianism [1872]—IV. The Heresy of Apollinaris—V. St. Cyril's Formula ΜΙΑ ΦΥΣΙΣ ΣΕΣΑΡΚΩΜΕΝΗ. (*Atlantis*, 1858)—VI. The Ordo de Tempore in the Breviary. (*Atlantis*, 1870)—VII. History of the Text of the Douay Version of Scripture. (*Rambler*, 1859).

6. POLEMICAL.

THE VIA MEDIA OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH.

Illustrated in Lectures, Letters and Tracts written between 1830 and 1841.

Two vols. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each.

This collection was first published in 1877.

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.—*The Prophetical Office of the Church, etc.*, originally published in 1837, reprinted with Notes and a Preface.

The Preface, which extends to about ninety pages, is one of Newman's most important polemical writings. His adversary is his former self. In his "Essay on Development," he dealt with one of the two great charges he used to bring against the Catholic Church; in this Preface he deals with the other.

CONTENTS OF VOL. II.—I. Suggestions in behalf of the Church Missionary Society, 1830—II. Via Media, 1834 (being Nos. 38 and 40 of *Tracts for the Times*)—III. Restoration of Suffragan Bishops, 1835—IV. On the Mode of Conducting the Controversy with Rome (being No. 71 of *Tracts for the Times*)—V. Letter to a Magazine in behalf of Dr. Pusey's Tracts on Holy Baptism, 1837—VI. Letter to the Margaret Professor of Divinity on Mr. R. H. Froude's Statements on the Holy Eucharist, 1838—VII. Remarks on Certain Passages in the Thirty-nine Articles, 1841 (being No. 90 of *Tracts for the Times*)—VIII. Documentary Matter consequent upon the foregoing Remarks on the Thirty-nine Articles—IX. Letter to Dr. Jelf in Explanation of the Remarks, 1841—X. Letter to the Bishop of Oxford on the same Subject, 1841—XI. Retractation of Anti-Catholic Statements, 1843-45.

** No. VII. in this Volume is the famous Tract 90 of *Tracts for the Times*, the whole with new Notes.

Cardinal Newman's Works—*continued.*

CERTAIN DIFFICULTIES FELT BY ANGLICANS IN CATHOLIC TEACHING CONSIDERED. Two vols. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each.

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.—Twelve Lectures addressed in 1850 to the party of the Religious Movement of 1833.

CONTENTS OF VOL. II.—I. Letter addressed to Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., on Occasion of his Eirenicon of 1864—II. A Letter addressed to the Duke of Norfolk, on Occasion of Mr. Gladstone's Expostulation of 1874.

LECTURES ON THE PRESENT POSITION OF CATHOLICS IN ENGLAND. Addresses to the Brothers of the Oratory in the Summer of 1851. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

APOLOGIA PRO VITA SUA, being a History of his Religious Opinions.

First published in 1864.

Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.
Pocket Edition. Fcp. 8vo. Cloth, 2s. 6d. *net.* Leather, 3s. 6d. *net.*
Popular Edition. 8vo. Paper covers, 6d. *net.*

The "Pocket" Edition and the "Popular" Edition of this book contain a letter, hitherto unpublished, written by Cardinal Newman to Canon Flanagan in 1857, which may be said to contain in embryo the "Apologia" itself.

7. LITERARY.

LOSS AND GAIN: The Story of a Convert. Cr. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

First published in 1848.

"Of his experience as a Catholic, *Loss and Gain*, published in 1848, was the first fruit . . . the book has been a great favourite with me, almost ever since its first publication, partly for the admirable fidelity with which it sketches young men's thoughts and difficulties, partly for its happy irony, partly for its perfect representation of the academical life and tone at Oxford. . . . In the course of the story there are many happy sketches of Oxford society, such as, for example, the sketch of the evangelical pietism which Mr. Freeborn pours forth at Bateman's breakfast, or the sketch of the Rev. Dr. Brownside's prim and pompous Broad Church University sermon. . . . Again, there is one very impressive passage *not* taken from Oxford life, in which Newman makes . . . [one of his characters] insist on the vast difference between the Protestant and Roman Catholic conception of worship."—R. H. HUTTON'S *Cardinal Newman.*

CALLISTA: A Tale of the Third Century. Cr. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

First published in 1855, with postscripts of 1856, 1881, 1888.

"It is an attempt to imagine and express, from a Catholic point of view, the feelings and mutual relations of Christians and heathens at the period to which it belongs."
Author's Preface.

VERSES ON VARIOUS OCCASIONS.

Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.
Pocket Edition. Fcp. 8vo. Gilt top, Cloth, 2s. *net.* Leather, 3s. *net.*

THE DREAM OF GERONTIUS.

16mo. Paper covers, 6d. Cloth, 1s. *net.*

With Introduction and Notes by MAURICE FRANCIS EGAN, D.D., LL.D. With Portrait. Crown 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Presentation Edition, with an Introduction specially written for this Edition by E. B(L). With Photogravure Portrait of Cardinal Newman, and 5 other Illustrations. Large Crown 8vo. Cream cloth, with gilt top, 3s. *net.*

LITERARY SELECTIONS FROM NEWMAN. With Introduction and Notes by A SISTER OF NOTRE DAME. Crown 8vo. 1s. 6d. (*Longmans' Class-Books of English Literature.*)

Cardinal Newman's Works—*continued.*

8. DEVOTIONAL.

MEDITATIONS AND DEVOTIONS. Part I. Meditations for the Month of May. Novena of St. Philip. Part II. The Stations of the Cross. Meditations and Intercessions for Good Friday. Litanies, etc. Part III. Meditations on Christian Doctrine. Conclusion. Crown 8vo. 5s. *net.*

Also in Three Parts as follows. Fcap. 8vo. Cloth, 1s. *net* each. Limp leather, 2s. *net* each.

Part I. THE MONTH OF MAY.

Part II. STATIONS OF THE CROSS.

Part III. MEDITATIONS ON CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

9. BIOGRAPHIES.

THE LIFE OF JOHN HENRY CARDINAL NEWMAN. Based on his Private Journals and Correspondence. By WILFRID WARD. With 2 Portraits. 2 vols. 8vo. 12s. 6d. *net.*

LETTERS AND CORRESPONDENCE OF JOHN HENRY NEWMAN DURING HIS LIFE IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH. With a brief Autobiography. Edited, at Cardinal Newman's request, by ANNE MOZLEY. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 7s.

"Materials for the present work were placed in the Editor's hands towards the close of 1884. The selection from them was made, and the papers returned to Cardinal Newman in the summer of 1887."—*Editor's Note.*

"It has ever been a hobby of mine, though perhaps it is a truism, that the true life of a man is in his letters. . . . Not only for the interest of a biography, but for arriving at the inside of things, the publication of letters is the true method. Biographers varnish, they assign motives, they conjecture feelings, they interpret Lord Burleigh's nods; but contemporary letters are facts."—*Dr. Newman to his sister, Mrs. John Mozley, May* 18, 1863.

10. POSTHUMOUS.

ADDRESSES TO CARDINAL NEWMAN, WITH HIS REPLIES, 1879-81. Edited by the Rev. W. P. NEVILLE (Cong. Orat.). With Portrait Group. Oblong crown 8vo. 6s. *net.*

NEWMAN MEMORIAL SERMONS: Preached at the Opening of the Newman Memorial Church, The Oratory, Birmingham, 8th and 12th December, 1909. By Rev. Fr. JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J., and Very Rev. Canon McINTYRE, Professor of Scripture at St. Mary's College, Oscott. 8vo. Paper covers, 1s. *net.*

SERMON NOTES, 1849-78. Edited by the FATHERS OF THE BIRMINGHAM ORATORY. With Portrait. Crown 8vo. 5s. *net.*

Cardinal Newman left behind him two MS. volumes filled with notes or memoranda of Sermons and Catechetical Instructions delivered by him during the years 1847 to 1879.

Besides their utility to priests and teachers, it is hoped that the notes will appeal to all lovers of Newman's writings. So characteristic of him are they, in spite of their brevity, that their authorship would be at once recognised even if they appeared without his name. Those of an earlier date are specially interesting. They introduce the reader to Newman in the first days of his Catholic life, settling down to the ordinary duties of an English priest, and instructing a "Mixed Congregation" in the rudiments of Catholic Doctrine.

INDEX.

	Page
Adventures of King James II. of England	9
Antony (C. M.) *In St. Dominic's Country*	12
——— *St. Antony of Padua* ...	13
——— *St. Pius V.*	13
Arundell (Lord) *Papers*	6
Ayscough (J.) *Gracechurch*	18
——— *Levia Pondera*	14
Balfour (Mrs. Reginald) *The Life and Legend of the Lady Saint Clare* ...	11
Barnes (A. S.) *Early Church in the Light of the Monuments*	3
Barrett (E. Boyd) *Motive Force and Motivation-Tracks*	4
Barry (W.) *The Tradition of Scripture* ...	3
Batiffol (P.) *Credibility of the Gospel* ...	4
——— *History of the Roman Breviary*	4
——— *Primitive Catholicism* ...	4
Benson (R. H.) *Child's Rule of Life* ...	16
——— *Christ in the Church* ...	15
——— *Confessions of a Convert*	10
——— *Cost of a Crown*	16
——— *Friendship of Christ* ...	15
——— *Maid of Orleans*	16
——— *Mystery Play*	16
——— *Non-Catholic Denominations*	3
——— *Old Testament Rhymes* ...	16
——— *Paradoxes of Catholicism*	15
Boedder (B.) *Natural Theology*	2
Bosch (Mrs. H.) *Bible Stories told to "Toddles"*	16
——— *Good Shepherd and His Little Lambs*	16
——— *When "Toddles" was Seven*	16
Bougaud (Mgr.) *History of St. Vincent de Paul*	12
Brown (M. J.) *Historical Ballad Poetry of Ireland*	17
Brown (S. J.) *A Guide to Books on Ireland*	14
——— *A Reader's Guide to Irish Fiction*	18
Browne (H.) *Handbook of Greek Composition*	21
——— *Homeric Study*	21
——— *Latin Composition*	21
Burton (E. H.) *Life and Times of Bishop Challoner*	7
——— and Myers (E.) *New Psalter and its Use*	3
——— and Pollen (J. H.) *Lives of the English Martyrs*	11
Camm (B.) *Lives of the English Martyrs*	11
Catholic Church from Within	6
Cecilia (Madame) *Spiritual Gleanings for Marian Sodalists*	15
Challoner, Life and Times of Bishop ...	7
Chapman (J.) *Bishop Gore and Catholic Claims*	6
Chisel, Pen, and Poignard	9
Christ, Life of, for Children	16
Clarke (R. F.) *Logic*	2
Class-Teaching (The) of English Composition	20
Coffey (P.) *The Science of Logic*	4
Conway (P.) *St. Thomas Aquinas* ...	13
Corcoran (T.) *Studies in the History of Classical Teaching*	20
Costelloe (L.) *St. Bonaventure*	13
Cronin (M.) *The Science of Ethics* ...	5
Curious Case of Lady Purbeck	9
Cuthbert (Fr.) *Life of St. Francis of Assisi*	11
De Bonnault d'Houet, Life of Viscountess, by Fr. Stanislaus	12
Delehaye (H.) *The Legends of the Saints*	3
De Montalembert (Count) *Life of St. Elizabeth of Hungary*	12
Devas (C. S.) *Political Economy*	2
——— *Key to the World's Progress*	5
Devas (R.) *Dominican Revival in the Nineteenth Century*	7
De Vere (Aubrey), Memoir of, by Wilfrid Ward	11
Dewe (J. A.) *Psychology of Politics and History*	6
De Wulf (M.) *History of Medieval Philosophy*	4
——— *Scholasticism, Old and New*	4
Digby, Life of Sir Kenelm	9
Dobrée (L. E.) *Stories on the Rosary* ...	16
Drane (A. T.) *History of St. Catherine of Siena*	11
——— *Memoir (Mother Francis Raphael)*	11
Dubray (C. A.) *Introductory Philosophy*	21
Dwight (T.) *Thoughts of a Catholic Anatomist*	5
Emery (S. L.) *The Inner Life of the Soul*	15
English (E.) *Sermons and Homilies* ...	15
Falklands	9
First Duke and Duchess of Newcastle-on-Tyne	9
Fitz-Gerald (V.) *St. John Capistran* ...	13
Fletcher (M.) *The Fugitives*	18
Fortescue (A.) *The Mass*	3
Fouard (Abbé) *St. John and the Close of the Apostolic Age*	12
——— *St. Paul and his Missions*	12
——— *St. Peter*	12
——— *The Christ the Son of God*	12
——— *Last Years of St. Paul*	12

	Page
Fountain of Life (The)	21
Francis (M. E.) *Christian Thal*	18
———— *Dorset Dear*	18
———— *Fiander's Widow* ...	18
———— *Lychgate Hall*	18
———— *Manor Farm*	18
———— *Yeoman Fleetwood* ...	18
Friar Saint Series	13
Gerard (J.) *The Old Riddle and the Newest Answer*	5
Grammar Lessons, by the Principal of St. Mary's Hall, Liverpool	20
Graves (A. P.) *Welsh Poetry*	17
Healy (T. M.) *Stolen Waters*	8
Hedley (J. C.) *Holy Eucharist*	3
Hogan (S.) *St. Vincent Ferrer*	13
Hoyt (F. D.) *Catherine Sidney*	18
Hughes (T.) *History of the Society of Jesus in North America*	8
Hunter (S. J.) *Outlines of Dogmatic Theology*	4
Index to The Month	6
Joppen (C.) *Historical Atlas of India* ...	20
Jörgensen (J.) *St. Francis of Assisi* ...	11
Joyce (G. H.) *Principles of Logic* ...	21
Joyce (P. W.) *Ancient Irish Music* ...	17
———— *Child's History of Ireland*	20
———— *English as we Speak it in Ireland*	20
———— *Grammar of the Irish Language*	20
———— *Handbook of School Management*	21
———— *History of Ireland for Australian Catholic Schools*	20
———— *Irish Peasant Songs* ...	17
———— *Old Celtic Romances* ...	17
———— *Old Irish Folk Music* ...	17
———— *Origin and History of Irish Names of Places*	8
———— *Outlines of the History of Ireland*	20
———— *Reading Book in Irish History*	20
———— *Short History of Ireland*	8
———— *Smaller Social History of Ancient Ireland*	8
———— *Story of Irish Civilisation*	8
———— *Wonders of Ireland* ...	8
Joyce (R. D.) *Ballads of Irish Chivalry*	17
Kane (R.) *Good Friday to Easter Sunday*	15
———— *Plain Gold Ring*	15
———— *Sermon of the Sea*	15
Keating (T. P.) *Science of Education* ...	21

	Page
Lives of the English Martyrs	11
Lives of the Friar Saints	13
Lockington (W. J.) *Bodily Health and Spiritual Vigour*	5
Maher (M.) *Psychology*	2
Mann (J. E. F.), Sievers (N. J.) and Cox (R. W. T.) *Real Democracy*	6
Marshal Turenne	9
Martindale (C. C.) *In God's Nursery* ...	14
Maturin (B. W.) *Laws of the Spiritual Life*	15
———— *Price of Unity* ...	6
———— *Self-Knowledge and Self-Discipline*	15
Maxwell-Scott (Hon. Mrs.) *Life of the Marquise de la Rochejaquelein* ...	11
Montalembert (Count de) *St. Elizabeth of Hungary*	11
Month	6
Moyes (J.) *Aspects of Anglicanism* ...	6
Mulhall (M. M.) *Beginnings, or Glimpses of Vanished Civilizations*	7
Nesbitt (M.) *Our Lady in the Church* ...	15
Newman (Cardinal) *Addresses to*, 1879-81	29
———— *Apologia pro Vita sua*	10, 28
———— *Arians of the Fourth Century*	27
———— *Callista, an Historical Tale*	28
———— *Church of the Fathers*	25
———— *Critical and Historical Essays*	26
———— *Development of Christian Doctrine*	24
———— *Difficulties of Anglicans*	28
———— *Discourses to Mixed Congregations*	23
———— *Discussions and Arguments*	26
———— *Dream of Gerontius*	28
———— *Essays on Miracles*	26
———— *Grammar of Assent*	25
———— *Historical Sketches*	25
———— *Idea of a University*	24
———— *Justification*	24
———— *Letters and Correspondence*	29
———— *Life*, by Wilfrid Ward	10, 29
———— *Literary Selections* ...	28
———— *Loss and Gain* ...	28

	Page
Newman (Cardinal) *Meditations and Devotions*	29
——— *Memorial Sermons*	29
——— *Oxford University Sermons*	23
——— *Parochial Sermons*	22
——— *Present Position of Catholics*	28
——— *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*	27
——— *Selections from Sermons*	22
——— *Sermon Notes*	29
——— *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*	23
——— *Sermons Preached on Various Occasions*	24
——— *Theological Tracts*	27
——— *University Teaching*	24
——— *Verses on Various Occasions*	28
——— *Via Media*	27
O'Brien (Mrs. William) *Unseen Friends*	11, 14
O'Dwyer (E. T.) *Cardinal Newman and the Encyclical, etc.*	6
O'Malley (A.) and Walsh (J. J.) *Pastoral Medicine*	5
O'Neill (G.) *Five Centuries of English Poetry*	21
Plater (C.) *Clergy and Social Action*	3
Policy and Paint	9
Pryings among Private Papers	9
Quick and Dead	21
Rickaby (John) *First Principles of Knowledge*	2
——— *General Metaphysics*	2
Rickaby (Joseph) *Moral Philosophy*	2
——— and McIntyre (Canon) *Newman Memorial Sermons*	29
Rochester and other Literary Rakes	9
Roche (W.) *The House and Table of God*	16
Rockliff (E.) *An Experiment in History Teaching*	26
Rose (V.) *Studies on the Gospels*	4
Rosmini (A.) *Theodicy*	5
Russell (M.) *Among the Blessed*	15
——— *At Home with God*	15
——— *The Three Sisters of Lord Russell of Killowen*	11
Ruville (A. Von) *Back to Holy Church*	10
Ryder (I.) *Essays*	10, 14
Sales (Brother De) *Teacher's Companion*	21
Scannell (T. B.) *The Priest's Studies*	3
Sheehan (P. A.) *Blindness of Dr. Gray*	19
——— *Early Essays and Lectures*	19
——— *Glenanaar*	19
——— *Intellectuals*	19
——— *Lisheen*	19
——— *"Lost Angel of a Ruined Paradise"*	19
——— *Luke Delmege*	19
——— *Miriam Lucas*	19
——— *Parerga*	19
——— *Queen's Fillet*	19
Smith (S. F.) *The Instruction of Converts*	3
Stöckl (A.) *Handbook of the History of Philosophy*	4
STONYHURST PHILOSOPHICAL SERIES	2
Stuart (J. E.) *The Education of Catholic Girls*	21
Terry (R. R.) *Old Rhymes with New Tunes*	16
Thesaurus Fidelium	15
Thurston (H.) *Lent and Holy Week*	6
Toohey (J. J.) *Synopsis of Newman's "Grammar of Assent"*	25
Vaughan (J. S.) *Happiness and Beauty*	14
Vices in Virtue	9
Walker (L. J.) *Theories of Knowledge*	2
Ward (B.) *Dawn of the Catholic Revival in England*	7
——— *Eve of Catholic Emancipation*	7
Ward (Wilfrid) *Aubrey de Vere, a Memoir*	11
——— *Essays on Men and Matters*	10
——— *Life of Cardinal Newman*	10, 29
——— *Life of Cardinal Wiseman*	10
——— *Ten Personal Studies*	10
——— *William G. Ward and the Catholic Revival*	10
Ward (Mrs. Wilfrid) *Great Possessions*	18
——— *Job Secretary*	18
——— *Light Behind*	18
——— *One Poor Scruple*	18
——— *Out of Due Time*	18
WESTMINSTER LIBRARY	3
WESTMINSTER VERSION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES	2
Wiseman (Cardinal) Life, by Wilfrid Ward	10
Wyatt-Davies (E.) *History of England for Catholic Schools*	20
——— *Outlines of British History*	20

No. 13. 10,000—xi/13. A.U.P.

UCSB LIBRARY
X-79846

X-79846
THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Santa Barbara

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW.

FEB 1 '82

Series 9482

3 68
2 28